Ramon Flecha

THE DIALOGIC SOCIETY

The sociology scientists and citizens like and use

THE DIALOGIC SOCIETY
The sociology scientists and citizens like and use

Ramon Flecha

INDEX

INTRODUCTION

This book is addressed to citizens, in all their diversity, who know they have the right to analyse and improve their societies. Some of you are professionals and/or develop activities which are not part of policy nor of academia; you will find in these pages the knowledge and actions that allow you to analyse your society and improve it, including your own life. Some of you are policy makers; you will find in this book the knowledge you need to decide which policies will succeed in coming closer to the objectives of the citizens who democratically elected you. Some of you are researchers and scholars from different fields of science; you will find here the knowledge and actions you need to guarantee that your scientific work leads to successful political and social impact. Some of you are sociologists; you will find here a different approach from what you have probably been exposed to so far, because the objective of these pages is to develop a sociology much more scientifically excellent and useful for all sorts of citizens, from a deeper knowledge drawing from a wide variety of disciplines. Some of you are students; you will find in this book the knowledge and actions necessary to become excellent professionals. Some of you are not policy makers, professionals, researchers, professors, sociologists nor students; you will find in these pages knowledge and actions that are co-created dialogically in science with you because as scientists, we need your voices to be in and society needs your voices to be in. Just a little look at the objectives of humanity (as the Sustainable Development Goals) clarifies most of them are primarily social, related to the themes scientifically studied by social sciences, like No Poverty, Zero Hunger, Gender Equality and Decent Work.

Dialogue is the main source of knowledge for this publication. Dialogue through books, cultural creations of humanity, and scientific articles. Dialogue with scientists from all fields of knowledge, policy makers from diverse ideologies, and citizens from diverse backgrounds and conditions. Among these dialogues, I should highlight the seminars "With the book in hand". Their functioning guarantees that the source of knowledge of this publication is totally free from any kind of contamination spread by those who talk and write about books they have never read. These seminars are

Dialogic Intellectual Gatherings because participants start their reflections by saying the page from which they want to share a comment, and the others can then check it because they have the book "in hand". In one of these Dialogic Intellectual Gatherings, since 1991, a hundred people coming from very different experiences and positions have been discussing, in twenty sessions yearly, the main books in all sciences.

We have read and debated more than five hundred books, including "Principles of Neural Sciences" by Kandel [1], "The Wealth of Nations" by Smith [2], "Women and social transformations" by Butler, Puigvert and Gernsheim [3], "The Evolution of Physics" by Einstein [4], "Civilization and its discontents" by Freud [5], "Economy and Society" by Weber [6], "A brief history of time" by Hawking [7], "On the origin of species" by Darwin [8], "On the genealogy of morality" by Nietzsche [9], "Historical, Political, and Moral Writings" by Weil [10], "The second sex" by Beauvoir [11], "Being and Time" by Heidegger [12], "The argumentative Indian" by Sen [13], "Language and mind" by Chomsky [14], "Pedagogy of the oppressed" by Freire [15], "Cultural anthropology" by Harris [16], "The limits of interpretation" by Eco [17], "Social history of art" by Hauser [18] or "Critique of pure reason" by Kant [19]. When Ulrich Beck participated in one dialogic intellectual gathering in 1998, he got so impressed with the theoretical level of even the youngest researchers that he exclaimed: "Where is the miracle?" [20].

The dialogue with cultural creations of humanity includes Dialogic Gatherings about operas, paintings, sculptures, poetry, theatre, or films, among others. The dialogue with scientific articles is part of the everyday work of any research group of excellence. In our case, these articles are not limited to one field of knowledge but to a wide diversity of them. The dialogue with scientists from mathematics, physics and any other science is part of our daily work in research projects. We also work in dialogue with the policy makers elected by citizens, and they are from diverse ideologies. Daily dialogue with the diversity of citizens, both face to face and through social media, is the main basis of our work. Everything you will find in this book has been co-created with all of them.

I hope you will read the book; you will always find me open to engage in a dialogue about what you agree with, disagree with, and I welcome any further ideas on how to make better Sociology for a better world.

I. NINE ORIENTATIONS FOR SOCIOLOGIES THAT SCIENTISTS AND CITIZENS LIKE AND USE

These nine orientations come from the scientific knowledge communicated in this book. I include them in the beginning in order to strengthen their revision while you are reading and dialoguing its pages.

1) **Dialogue.** Co-creation is already a criterion, and even a requirement, in scientific research programmes in all sciences. Citizens want to see Article 27 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights come true: their right "to share in scientific advancement and its benefits". Co-creation originated in studies co-led by sociologists. These sociologies that citizens like and use include egalitarian dialogue with citizens, both in the creation of scientific knowledge about society and in the practice of the profession in any context.

2) **Improvement.** The main objective of these sociologies is the improvement of citizens' lives. Therefore, they seek to publicly present evidence of the social impacts they achieved and/or the potential future impact they will generate with the scientific knowledge they create or the practice they develop. When these sociologies contribute to improving society and the individuals within, citizens acknowledge their value, and sociologists' remuneration increases.

3) **Truth**. All sciences have been created to find truths. Dialogic sociologies clarify, publicly and democratically, which statements are grounded in scientific evidence, and which are hoaxes. When some sociologists present their sexist or racist biases or their own ideological choices as if they were sociology, they mislead citizens and destroy public support for sociology. One of the requirements for truth is that authors base their writings on what they have directly read – and it is even better if what they read is debated. The writings based on what authors have not directly read are harmful to both sociology and society.

4) **Goodness.** Sociology is born and part of democracy. In a democracy nobody can impose what is good or bad, citizens have very different

ideas about it. Democracy was created so that diverse citizens could live together in agreement to what is considered socially and legally good (such as freedom) and bad (such as rape). These sociologies do not try to impose on citizens what they (and the policy makers they elect) should do. On the contrary, these sociological analyses provide knowledge that facilitates citizens' progress towards their own objectives.

5) **Beauty.** The beauty or ugliness of a home lies in the paintings on the walls, as well as in the human relationships inside it. The beauty or ugliness of the Earth remains in the landscapes and monuments, as well as in the human relationships within. Dialogic sociologies create social beauty with the knowledge they produce, the methodologies they use, their egalitarian dialogues with diverse citizens and the improvements they generate.

6) **Gender.** These sociologies include the analyses of the discriminations suffered by diverse sexual and gender identities in their studies and their professional practices and provide knowledge to take steps towards the equality of all human beings without any discrimination.

7) **Cultures.** Dialogic sociologies include the analyses of the discriminations suffered by diverse cultural and religious groups in their studies and their professional practices and provide knowledge to take steps towards the equality of all humans without any racist or belief discrimination.

8) **Universal.** The sociologies that citizens like work in communication with all the scientific community, sharing knowledge and successful actions with all scientists and citizens from any context worldwide. These sociologies practise the values that citizens democratically decide in their professional and/or scientific exercise: non-sexism, non-racism, solidarity, and fraternity with all humans.

9) **Forward-looking.** These sociologies are in solidarity with all citizens, and especially with the next generations of humans, with the society and with the Earth in which they will live.

II. SOCIETY IS DIALOGIC

Dialogue is the source of knowledge

In my work commissioned by the European Commission as Chair of an Expert Group of specialists of the highest level in the different natural and social sciences, I have experienced the profound need for theoretical contributions that allow us to overcome the current disorientation in which we live. Some of the work we did has had a central axis in the design of the criteria that guarantee that scientific knowledge improves the lives of humanity as a whole and of each individual.

The history of science is full of contributions to the improvement of our lives; we all have experienced this. During the first months of the COVID-19 pandemic, the health personnel made incredible efforts that were recognised every night by the citizens who came out to applaud them from the windows of the homes where they were confined. However, the moment in which our health was best protected was when the vaccines brought by science arrived. Social improvement can be simplified by understanding it as a multiplication between two factors: even if the first (effort and professional motivation) is 10, if the second factor is close to 0, the result is very unsatisfactory. Only when the two factors are close to 10 the result is excellence. The second factor is constituted by the scientific knowledge existing at any given time.

Behind the word "science", there are extraordinary persons who, despite having saved our lives, receive less recognition than celebrities of trash TV. Although some scientists may stand out (such as the excellent scientist Katalin Karikó), scientific knowledge (and all other knowledge) is the result of the dialogue among many people. In particular in the analysis of this pandemic and in the search for solutions, scientists from many countries and conditions have collaborated more than ever before and much more rapidly.

I have been fortunate enough to hear a Nobel Prize laureate in Physics tell his personal story directly at his home. As a child, he was separated from his parents and did not know where they were to try to save him. He now values his parents' efforts and the help of the Christian families and priests who

risked their lives for a child in order to save his life because of the Nazis. The now Nobel Prize laureate wanted to make great contributions to humankind so that such things would never happen to anyone again. He found in science one way to do it. He always cultivated his human relationships and friendships; he worked all his life with a friend, and together they made their contributions, in continuous dialogue. Unfortunately, the Nobel Prize came just after his friend died, but he always said that they both deserved it equally. My colleague (and friend) Marta Soler and I have spent years searching and finding charming stories of friendship behind multiple scientific contributions.

Some reductionist defences of science have opposed it to traditional popular knowledge. Instead, scientists have been able to create scientific knowledge thanks to the dialogue with this traditional popular knowledge. Chinese Nobel Prize in Medicine To Youyou discovered artemisinin, the best treatment against malaria (in combination with other drugs) based on the knowledge accumulated by traditional Chinese medicine. Aristarchus sustained a heliocentric conception already three centuries before Christ. Amartya Sen [13] remarks that the Indian Āryabhaṭa, in the 6th century after Christ, also sustained heliocentrism with a conception of the diurnal motion of the Earth. The debate about why humanity had to wait so many centuries to overcome geocentrism has different positions. Some outline that the mathematical calculations by Aristarchus were not strong enough to generate this overcoming and that Copernicus's ones were very rigorous. Others sustain this delay as a consequence of Western ethnocentrism. In any case, the role of the Renaissance's analysis of ancient knowledge (like Platonism) in the scientific revolution initiated by Copernicus is clearly demonstrated. In this context, although it is still not sufficiently demonstrated, it is difficult to think that his heliocentrism has no link with the one of Aristarchus of Samos.

Social sciences (as other sciences) have been created through dialogue and are developed with dialogue. People want to know our society and be able to bring our reality closer to the dreams we so much desire. We have many questions about how to educate our children, what decisions to make about our health, who to vote for in elections, how to best enjoy our sexuality, what decisions to make to ensure the quality of life throughout our existence, how

to leave a better world for those who come after us, what to do to help prevent wars, and how to avoid violence in our daily lives. Although the best ways to address each of these issues are case-specific, they all have a common basis that requires (among other things) social theories, which are discussed in this book.

All kinds of religions and beliefs have provided diverse explanations, sometimes even about very specific details of natural phenomena or our human existence. Although knowledge such as mathematics and philosophy are millennia old, the natural sciences have only recently been consolidated as such, and the human sciences are even more recent. Different authors identified this modernising process with a secularisation of societies in which religions would tend to be reduced to a minimum. Even the most prominent sociologist of this idea, Peter Berger, had to rectify it when he was surprised to see that the reality was the opposite of what he had predicted. In his 1967 book "The Sacred Canopy" [21] he still talked about the "pervasive influence of science", and it was not until 1999 that he published the book entitled "The Desecularization of the World: Resurgent Religion and World Politics" [22].

Some authors affirm that humankind only sustains a mythical explanation of a natural phenomenon until it discovers its scientific explanation. Such statements are only true when they make explicit that scientific progress does not suppress the cultural richness of mythological contributions, but simply places them in their realm, in a parallel way that is not contrary to science. Instead, a very reductionist vision of knowledge has tended to identify everything that is not a scientifically proven truth as false. Sometimes there are even terms for scientific concepts fully accepted by universities and international organisations (such as the concept of neuromyths) that identify the very word "myth" with false. In fact, that is one of the common meanings in dictionaries such as the Cambridge Dictionary [23]: "a commonly believed but false idea". However, in those same dictionaries, such meaning is the second one, while the first one is very positive and reflects the importance of mythology for humankind: "an ancient story or set of stories, especially explaining the early history of a group of people or about natural events and facts". Although I myself use this term because of the general

agreement about it, I would be happy if we changed it for something like "neurohoax".

In modernity, humankind has been learning to differentiate the realm of science from that of the spiritual and to ensure more and more individual freedom to believe or not in a religion. The only time I was ever in real danger of death was driving back from a dinner with Peter L. Berger. None of the many people I know of various religions would have told the ambulance not to give me scientifically supported treatments. Nor would I have stopped any religious person from praying for my health. Although this dialogue does not yet exist in all contexts and environments on the planet, no one can deny, with the evidence in hand, how far we have come in this direction.

Dialogic daily life

Dialogue is not only the source of knowledge but also the source of our daily life. Maybe some young people do not know that this dialogic life has changed dramatically in the past decades. Still in the middle of the 20th century, in most of the homes of the world from very diverse countries, the rules were made and imposed by "the man of the family"; in some countries he even received the name of "head of the family". Household tasks were done by his wife, girls frequently collaborated as well, for instance, making their own beds, and sometimes being obliged to make the ones of their brothers as well. The head of the family decided almost everything, even the TV programme to be watched.

It would be very innocent and wrong to say that this kind of home with this very sexist assignment of tasks does not exist anymore, but it would be also very wrong to say that there have not been transformations. It is very clear that still today women in general do much more domestic work than men, but it is also true that many men are doing much more than what men used to do in the past, and some of them more than their sisters or their wives. One hundred years ago, what the husband and the wife had to do at home was very clear; now in many homes the distribution of chores is continuously

submitted to dialogue among their cohabitants, including permanent negotiations, agreements, discussions, and new negotiations.

When we wake up in a family with more members than showers, there probably is an agreement (maybe unconscious) that it is to be used first by only one of them and after by another one, instead of sharing it at the same time. Maybe another shared rule is that each individual makes and eats their own breakfast and later washes up or puts the dishes in the dishwasher. In many homes, there are individuals who always act following the consensual rules and others that "forget" to put the dishes in the dishwasher. Even some of those homes have had a dialogic transformation because decades ago this unequal performance of tasks was the rule, and no one discussed it; now it is against the rules and frequently there are discussions about how to correct it. Similarly, when we take a public bus, we know that decades before we arrived at the agreement in most countries that there are no seats reserved for white men and forbidden for persons from other cultural groups.

Behind any of those advancements of rights, there are many humans that have worked hard in the past to obtain what we have now. Also, currently there are many persons working for getting new advancements of rights not for only them but for the whole of humanity. Most readers of this book are doing those advancements and/or supporting those persons doing them. The rights are conquered through dialogues, including the initial disagreements and the sometimes very difficult process to get agreements avoiding and preventing any possible violence. In fact, there are only two ways to organise human relationships: dialogue or violence. Dialogue is the only road for eliminating violence.

The concept of "inherited agreements" makes us aware of the many agreements made by humans in the past which are now (consciously or unconsciously) the basis of our current lives and relations. When we go shopping by walking, we wait until the traffic light is green before crossing the street; when we go to pay, if we find a queue, without talking to one another, we place ourselves at the end and the next customer does the same. There are thousands of agreements like these ones which are necessary for current human life and existed before we were born.

Many authors, from different disciplines, have made very interesting contributions to the scientific analysis of this base of our daily life. The concept of "inherited agreements" has been elaborated taking into account those diverse contributions within the new perspective of current dialogic societies. Husserl [24] created the concept of lifeworld, one of the precursors of the concept of "inherited agreements" to which its sociological twist made by Schütz [25], the founder of phenomenological sociology, also contributed. Unfortunately, Schütz did not collaborate with Mead and did not introduce the interactionist perspective in his concept of lifeworld.

The move from lifeworld to inherited agreements has made three contributions. First, it clarifies that this inheritance was generated by previous dialogues and consensus of our ancestors; the meaning of green and red colour in traffic lights is an example. Second, those agreements are arbitrary and could be different in diverse cultures and countries; in the United Kingdom, Kenia, India, New Zealand and in Jamaica, among other countries, cars drive on the left. Third, having been created by dialogue, they can be changed through new dialogues; many clubs where decades ago only men were allowed, are now open to men, women and any other sexual or gender identities.

That citizens share a sense of the queue and of keeping their turn in it does not explain the origin of this agreement. The most cited classical sociologist, Max Weber, made it clear that social action was the one in which the meaning was shared [6] but did not clarify the origin of this meaning. In case some readers are not familiar with or do not like the abstraction of these concepts, I will introduce a concrete example. If two colleagues go together to vote in the general elections of their country, maybe it is because they share the meaning of voting; Weber clarifies this is a social action because both share its meaning, but he does not clarify which is the origin of this meaning.

Parsons and Schütz took the same starting point from Weber, but they gave two different and to some extent opposite answers. First Parsons was focused on elaborating a theory of social action, but the rise of Nazism motivated him to dedicate the rest of his life to consolidate the democratic system against dictatorships (he was also scared about communism). His last books

were more dedicated to a theory of the social system. Therefore, his answer to Weber's ambiguity was that the system was the one to introduce the meaning in the human beings that share it in social action. In the case of the previous example, following Parsons means that the origin is the system that needs people to vote.

Parsons and Schütz were working on sociology simultaneously in the USA, but they did not collaborate. Schütz, besides knowing Husserl, had the opportunity to attend Weber's lectures. His answer was that the meaning is given by human beings. Following his theory means that the will to vote came from themselves. This answer placed Schütz's theory close to the symbolic interactionism created by Mead (although he did not use this name) and widely spread at that moment in the country where Schütz was working as he had to escape from Vienna due to the rise of Nazism. But Schütz criticised the behaviourism of Mead and, in my view, lost the opportunity to make a dialogic turn to Husserl's concept of lifeworld making it more sociological, more able to comprehend society and mainly the current society. Symbolic interactionism studies the interactions that create our ideas, actions, and selves. It can be used to study the interactions of each of the colleagues that make them willing to vote, but Schütz did not do that.

The concept of inherited agreements takes into account all the contributions, and, on the shoulders of those giants, it goes beyond. This dialogic concept allows us to analyse the dialogues through which those two colleagues have reached and shared the meaning to vote, and to what extent this came from dialogues with other peers or from the political system in the form of publicity in favour of voting. It also allows us to analyse what kind of dialogue can change this meaning and move both or one of them to vote for another option or even to not vote.

Daily peace

I have signed a contract to make a report for the European Commission entitled: "Achieving student well-being for all: Educational contexts free of violence". Looking at and analysing the data and the testimonies about violence in schools creates a profound sadness and indignation that makes it

difficult to sleep. This sensation can generate the error of thinking that the situation is worse than ever. However, the scientific literature provides enough evidence showing that the situation in the past was even worse and, although the present violence is terrible for many children, we are reducing it and creating more successful actions that transform children from victims into survivors.

Decades ago, physical violence was not forbidden from teachers to students, and it was even considered positive from fathers and mothers to their children. The dialogic evolution of societies includes the progressive overcoming of violence. When I was a school pupil, fifty years ago, I could see every year a man beating a woman in the street, sometimes with their children in front of them, and only a few people stopped him. Fifty years ago, I could see every year two men beating each other after having a crash with their cars. I have not seen that in the last thirty years. Important steps have been made towards more peaceful relationships in homes, schools, sports, nightlife, and streets.

We need to recognise the steps our predecessors took in the past and, on this basis, we can make more and better steps towards the objective of zero violence in all personal relationships, towards the personal peace which is one of the solid bases for world peace. Most programmes for the prevention of violence against children have not presented any scientific evidence about their results, and those who do present scientific evaluations of their results recognise that they have not found improvements. The few presenting scientific evidence of successful results are based on the successful actions that have already been scientifically validated, which are based on dialogue that includes both the plurality of all diverse voices and the scientific evidence. One of the most urgent tasks to be done is to redesign the programmes in order to replicate, in all contexts, the same improvement of results of the successful ones.

There is a more intense and conflictive ongoing debate regarding whether humanity has made progress or not toward a more peaceful world. On both sides, most approaches focus on peace and war among countries or blocks of countries. The violence among countries is decided by the ruling powers of society sending citizens who have not decided to break the peace to kill

each other. The violence or the peace in our personal relationships is decided by us. Even those who state they can do nothing to stop the wars among countries are aware that they can do much to overcome the violence in the contexts where they develop their everyday life. They are aware, but often they do not do so. Why is this happening? What are the contributions of social theories to overcome this situation? How can we improve those contributions?

Most authors talking and writing about personal violence are focused on analyses leading to a diagnosis and, when they are asked for, they add their recommendations. However, they cannot demonstrate that those recommendations have been successful in any place; they are based on their ideologies or opinions, not on a scientific analysis of reality. Besides, they themselves have never successfully implemented those recommendations in any context, not even in their own families or friends or colleagues. Ironically, this is like heart surgeons who have never done a successful intervention and give recommendations that have never generated successful interventions by other persons.

Other authors focus their analysis not only mainly on diagnosis, but on the analysis of the actions that are already being successful in overcoming violence. They do not give their opinions or their personal recommendations; instead, they clarify the orientations and actions in which potential success is validated and supported by the already existing realities. Science has clarified some actions which are incredibly successful in overcoming personal violence, of everyday life violence. Just as one example, top scientific journals have provided evidence about the incredible success of the Zero Violence Brave Club [26] in the overcoming of any sort of violence in schools and other social sites.

This and other successful actions are also officially recommended by governments and international organisations like the European Commission. They are as effective at overcoming violence as anti-covid vaccines defending our health. Nevertheless, the authors that have not overcome violence in any place write a lot about diverse assumptions to avoid the implementation of those successful actions in all places. Some say that violence is in the human genes and cannot be overcome, and hence, that

children should learn how to live with it. Others say that those successful actions in some countries should not be implemented in their own countries because this would be cultural colonisation. There are also professionals saying that those actions that have been successful in some schools should not be implemented in theirs because each school has to find its own way. Instead of taking steps towards peace in their contexts, they use students as objects of opinions and assumptions that increase violence.

At this moment, in the rankings such as that of Google Scholar, I am the first scientist in the world in the area of Gender Violence, and four feminists from our research centre CREA are on the top ten positions from this list. Sarah Rankin, then Director of the Harvard Office of Sexual Assault Prevention and Response wrote about CREA's work: "Future generations of students and faculty will undoubtedly have a very different experience because of their work". Governments and international organisations request us to elaborate reports and recommendations about the actions and strategies that enable the overcoming of diverse forms of violence.

When the media comes to me to answer their questions, I ask them to work in the same way they do in the area of health. The most famous newspapers and TV programs publish their articles about health issues in which they include citations to scientific journals which are the source of the information; the interview with the specialist is in order to better explain to the general public what is published in these scientific journals. Most media and journalists act very differently when they publish about gender violence, or about violence in general. These types of journalists do not care about what is scientifically true about the matter, but about how to increase their audience, and a great part of this audience looks for sensationalism. One important head of a public medium justified it by saying that this is what their audiences demand, more scandal than information [27].

Unfortunately, many authors of social sciences collaborate with such hoaxes for several reasons, such as their will to have a voice in the media or receive economic retribution. There is quite a lot of criticism of the interests promoting wars, such as those of the gun industry. On the contrary, there is no similar criticism of the particular interests in disseminating the hoax that

promote gender violence and other kinds of daily violence. What is more, the criticism of those particular interests is considered personal discrediting.

Many actions against universal violence like wars are focused on the culture of peace through peace education. At the same time, one of the main well-known pieces of evidence is that children learn the values we practise more than the values we talk about. For this reason, I never answer the questions of those kinds of journalists, I only collaborate with journalists that are excellent professionals and who care about giving real information to their audience. The culture of peace needs to be promoted through the overcoming of daily violence, which is a requirement to overcome universal violence. This very relevant task needs a clear improvement of the social theories, including interdisciplinarity with all types of knowledge.

Dialogic policy

I was commissioned by the European Commission to elaborate the criteria of impact of all sciences in policies, in citizen engagement, and in other areas of societal impact [28]. Frequently, political parties and their followers evaluate the policy success mainly by the results in the elections. In the current situation, this is not always coordinated with the social impact. Sometimes the majority of voters support policies that are not the ones which generate the best improvement of citizens' lives. But the situation is starting to change; the science literacy of citizens, which includes their prominence in the evaluation of social impact, has been initiated. Increasing citizens' awareness is already fostering a bigger correlation between policy success and social impact.

The inclusive communication of science is fostering citizens' demand that policies not only be able to gain votes but also to improve society. The decrease of dogmatic political hooliganism in favour of the increase of more informed support is very important. In other words, many dogmatic hooligans of one political party support their option and attack the other options whatever they do. With the ongoing inclusive communication of science, citizens become more informed about the policies based on evidence and the policies based on hoaxes and, still more decisive, about policies that

have social impact and policies that do not have it. The criteria of gaining or losing votes of their option is not the priority for an increasing number of citizens anymore, but the improvement of society generated by their own options and others' ones; winning votes will increasingly become a consequence of those improvements at the same time that populisms and the number of dogmatist hooligans decrease.

Although there are intermittent progress and setbacks (one of them during the COVID-19 pandemic) when comparing the present situation with 1975, almost twice as many citizens than before are now living in democracies (better and worse ones), which is already more than half of the world's population [29]. It is clear that parliaments and governments exercise their power deciding legislations and their execution, but it is also true that now many more countries are led by the representatives elected by citizens' votes and that they dialogue more than before with citizens and their organisations.

This process goes on simultaneously with an increasing crisis of representative democracies and the failure of their top-down initiatives to promote citizens' participation in what policy makers decide. Institutions, policy makers and civic organisations are worried because this crisis of trust on current political parliaments is faced in some countries and social sectors with the rise of populisms instead of the generation of new and more participatory politics.

Machiavelli's influence on some policy makers and scholars of political sciences is not a contribution but a barrier to this needed change. He was very clear when he wrote: "For a long time I have not said what I believed, nor do I ever believe what I say, and if indeed sometimes I do happen to tell the truth, I hide it among so many lies that it is hard to find" [30]. On the contrary, Chomsky wrote [31]: "it is the responsibility of intellectuals to speak the truth and to expose lies"; that is what scientists do. It is impossible to base scientific knowledge on lies. Of course, it is possible to base the exercise of political power on lies, but this is not the kind of politics citizens want now and the democracies need in order to be trusted by citizens. Some authors have presented "Il Principe" [32] as the founding base of the modern state and the political sciences. Actually, it was the basis of only some dynamics of the modern state and political science. Democracy and political

sciences had in the past and have today other origins, such as people believing in democracy and fighting for it even under dictatorships. Most colleagues I knew in the clandestine movement for democracy under Franco's dictatorship and I confronted problems in our academic and professional careers, and we have never accepted political positions, we worked for improving society with democracy, not for any will of power.

The generalised mistaken image about the historical role of the Medici has misguided the analysis of the influence of Machiavelli in the construction and evolution of the modern state. "Il Principe" [32] was written analysing what contemporary politicians like the Medici did in the beginning of the 16th century and what Machiavelli thought they should do. The reality of the 21st century is totally different; it needs and has more and better theories and political scientists researching and communicating the truth; just to mention some, we have very rigorous and influential contributions from the theory of deliberative democracy and real utopias such as the citizen assemblies [33].

Touristic face-to-face and online visits to Florence frequently substitute the scientific analysis. Many people are told that the Medici were the creators of the cultural Renaissance, the promoters of the scientific revolution and the pioneers of the current modern states. On the contrary, the main source of the cultural Renaissance was the contribution of Platonism and the interest in classical culture brought from the East, especially following the conquest of Constantinople by the Ottoman Empire in 1453. The scientific revolution starts with Copernicus influenced by this Platonism and classical culture, including the heliocentrism of Pythagoreanism. The Medici were the main patrons and politicians to support both the cultural Renaissance and the scientific revolution, but they were not their creators.

Many defenders of Machiavelli as the creator of the model of the modern state do not know that the same year that the first version of "Il Principe" (with the title of "De Principatibus") was published, one member of the Medici family was crowned the Pope (Leon the 10th). He was the one promoting the richness of The Vatican and the indulgences against which the various Protestant Reforms rose. As Max Weber, among others, has demonstrated [34], capitalism and the modern state owe much more to the Protestant Reformation than to the Catholic papacy. There is a consensus

that the "Il Principe" and the political theory of Machiavelli are not linked to those protestant reforms but to the exercise of power by Catholics like the Medici and others. In other words, in order to better understand the social and intellectual sources of the Modern State, it would be more helpful to read "The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism" [34] than "Il Principe".

The current scientific revolution is an outstanding resource to contest the crisis of distrust on politics and democracy across countries. Dialogue is the basis of the two priority criteria of such scientific revolution, and they are increasingly being incorporated into the most important research programmes in all sciences. The first criterion is social impact; we must create knowledge that will allow humankind to move towards their own goals. The second is co-creation, which requires that this scientific knowledge is created in continuous dialogue with the people, governments, organisations, and companies concerned.

Dialogic policies provide a fruitful perspective for the revitalisation of the diverse policies and citizens' support to democracy. They have two characteristics that make them have a great social impact with clear improvements for the individuals and societies. The first one is taking into account the plurality of voices. In recent years, we are witnessing the continuous creation of new and diverse democratic actors, some of them favoured by digital communication, with examples from all parts of the world, such as the AfricTivistes co-founded and coordinated by Aisha Dabo [35]. Simultaneously, there is the creation of processes to foster the dialogue between policy makers and citizens before or in the process of elaborating laws and policies: citizen assemblies, parliament consultations, referendums. The second characteristic is the inclusion of scientific evidence of social impact in the dialogue. Recently, we are seeing the creation of new forms for doing this important task, such as the science advice mechanisms in some European Parliaments, and in some cases promoted bottom-up by civic organisations such as "Ciencia en el Parlamento" (Science at the Parliament) in Spain [36].

There are participative processes strengthening the plurality of voices without taking science into account. Those are participatory politics but not dialogic policy, and they frequently do not have any social impact, any

improvement of the results. On the other side of the same coin, there are scientists hoping that policy makers make decisions based on their research, dismissing the voices of "lay citizens" and frequently not having any improvement of results. The traditional fight between the top-down and bottom-up approaches is currently overcome by dialogic policy. They oppose one another, as the preference for the moon or the stars. We need both, the moon and the stars, to enjoy the beauty of the night and we need both, top-down and bottom-up approaches, to develop successful policies that obtain successful social impact, improvements of the citizens' lives and their support to policies and democracies.

Scientists have the duty to explain the theories and practices they have successfully implemented. Archaeologists who are the main reference in their discipline have the duty to explain the extraordinary successful excavations they have chaired, biochemists who are the main reference in their disciplines have the duty to explain the extraordinary laboratory discoveries they have chaired. In some areas of knowledge, there is still an anachronic criticism to those who fulfil this duty, because this fact discomforts the authors of the same field who have never successfully implemented what they speak or write about. I would have not elaborated the criteria of policy impact of research if I had not had this policy impact in my own research studies. As far as I know, I am the only social scientist chairing projects in the last four European Scientific Programmes.

The first project [37] had an impact on policy when its main conclusion, the recognition of Roma people as a European minority, was approved by unanimity by the European Parliament. This approval generated European, National and Regional policies, like the European Roma strategy, with a clear social impact. That could have never been done by an individual social scientist. This was the result of the co-creation of fifty researchers from different fields in continuous dialogue, from the beginning until the end, with policy makers, Roma individuals, and organisations. In fact, the main conclusions were presented in the headquarters of the European Parliament by a Roma woman who introduced herself saying she was an illiterate great-grandmother from one of the poorest European contexts. The whole study used the communicative methodology of research, the pioneer of the dialogic policy and the criteria of co-creation and social impact. Amartya Sen wrote

about a work by one of his master students made with communicative methodology: "This is an elegant and clarifying debate about the problems arising when the distributive is understood in terms of opportunities and availability of resources, without taking into account the inequalities that arise from cultural conventions and social barriers".

The second project [38] was the only social sciences and humanities one included in the list published by the European Commission about ten successful stories of European Research. It clarified the successful educational actions that had been included in European Recommendations and in policies approved by European and non-European countries. Those successful educational actions are now implemented in more than fifteen thousand schools with the extraordinary improvements of results published by scientific journals and receiving the prize for the best article of the year 2013 in Cambridge Journal of Education [39]. Instead of finishing its implementation at the end of the project's official term and the funding, it is being increased year by year with the support of governments, companies, teachers, families, and students.

The third project [40] generated very useful and profound transformations but also had very sad moments in its process. The main impact was to clarify how researchers can get their studies to have policy and social impact. Moreover, a new methodology was created in order to scientifically analyse citizens' voices in social media: Social Media Analytics. The saddest moments were mainly in the evaluation of the already finished projects in the area of social sciences and humanities. Frequently, Principal Investigators told us they had had no policy and social impact at all, some of them even refused to answer saying that this was not their task. Asking those who accepted to be interviewed why they had no impact, the answers clearly indicated that they did not think about this as a mistake of their research: many answered that, because neoliberalism does not care about social improvements, policy makers read and understand nothing, and citizens prefer the garbage distributed by the media rather than their intellectual insights.

When asking them about the requirement for having social impact, the majority of the answers referred to the victory of the political parties more

related to them or closer to their ideologies. The few projects having policy impact follow a very different approach. Successful researchers trust the results of their studies, their potentiality to be the base of policies that generate social impact and consequently citizens' satisfaction and participation. They do not link their policy impact to the ideology of the governments. The non-successful researchers have no trust in the capacity of their results to generate policies unless the policy makers in the governments are personally or ideologically related to them.

The fourth one is still in process [41], but its orientation by dialogic policy has already obtained relevant policy results. First, it has successfully mobilised citizens frequently using social media to clarify by themselves which statements are hoaxes and which ones are scientific evidence in two different areas: gender and education. Then, policy makers have started to develop policies to promote inclusive communication of science; for instance, the Department of Science of the Spanish Government has published the book "Towards Inclusive Science Communication" coordinated by myself, the PI of Allinteract [42]. One of the positive things about dialogic policy is that its policy and social impacts already start during the realisation of the research project and continue many years after the project has finally ended and there is no more funding.

Dialogic organisations

Most organisations from different fields and activities are now more dialogic than decades ago. There is an increase of the dialogues they have with the citizens that support them and also with the wider society. The citizens giving money for humanitarian associations want to know much more than before about the use of their resources, and now, also about the social impact resulting from its use. In the first stage, the demand for transparency was mainly in order to know whether they were using those resources for the official objectives or there are deviations of funds for other purposes that were not made explicit publicly; there was an increasing interest to know the proportion of funds arriving to the persons and groups for which the organisation worked, and the proportion used for paying their staff, office

and other costs. All this was done in order to ensure transference, which means the use of the resources for and by the target groups of citizens.

Now, there is a new and much more important priority, the social impact, the improvements the target groups and individuals get from the activities of the organisation; besides using the resources for and by those people, it is now important to have evidence of the steps they have done to accomplish their own objectives as a consequence of this use.

Another increase of the dialogues of organisations is among their members. The movement of persons with the same disability and/or their families are now much larger than some years ago, and they also have much more and better scientific information than before about the issues they most need. Some of the members are doing wonderful inclusive communication of science, explaining to one another the scientific evidence they need to improve their wellbeing, their lives. With Social Media Analytics, we have found that some vulnerable groups are less active in social media than the privileged ones, but this is not the case of persons with the same disability, they are very active and very efficient in social media [42].

The associations of patients with the same disease and/or their families were created long ago, but now they are getting much more support than in the past, strengthening the dialogues among their members and with the diverse sectors and representatives of the whole society. Now, some of those organisations and members are participating in the scientific progress in the matters related to their own diseases and receiving their benefits.

Of course, much more should be done and there are still patients of some diseases that receive very little support. The focus restricted to transference, omitting social impact, provokes little attention to the diseases that affect mainly poor countries and poor people because there are no companies interested in the funding of the research and production of medicines that patients cannot pay for. The current change of focus to social impact, to the transference oriented towards social impact, creates a context with options for a better and more egalitarian health care. Social impact focuses on the improvement of all diverse citizens, including poor countries and poor

people, which benefits not only the health of poor people, but the whole population.

Even most of those who agree with the statement that organisations are having a dialogic transformation deny this process in the case of enterprises due to the fact that their main goal is to maximise profit. Nevertheless, current scientific analysis detects more dialogic processes in many companies than ever before; instead of reducing their economic success, many of them are increasing it thanks to this dialogic transformation. Of course, this is not the case for all of them, the result depends on the quality of their dialogic orientation. For that reason, it is very important for science and society to analyse the companies that are making clear steps at the same time towards dialogue and towards economic success.

The former president of the American Sociological Association, Erik Olin Wright, created a very interesting research project with the title "Real Utopias" [33]. Accepting that in real life there are no perfect utopias exactly coinciding with citizens' dreams, his project analysed and clarified some realities that have made more steps towards those utopias. Among them, we can see different types of organisations (such as the participatory budget in the city of Porto Alegre, Wikipedia, or Mondragon cooperative) that have become more dialogic than in the past. Particularly, he included as the best economic real utopia the Mondragon group of cooperatives. The geographic environment of the majority of its companies is the one with the lowest Gini coefficient worldwide, which means it is the one with the lowest income inequalities. It is not by chance that Mondragon is also the most dialogic group of successful companies worldwide.

Erik's focus was sociological, not blinded by ideological dogmatism. In fact, he was against cooperatives for decades, although his close friend and great sociologist Michael Burawoy was in favour of them. The public sociology [43] elaborated by Burawoy, former President of the International Sociological Association, is oriented to society and citizens. It is one of the current sociologies more in the style of what citizens like, because it is very sensitive to their needs and demands.

Long debates in Barcelona with sociologists who profoundly know Mondragon made Erik decide to change and choose this as the best real utopia in economy. The key argument for the change was that some ideologies have killed millions of people for the promise of an egalitarian society that has not arrived, while this group of companies has the lowest Gini index without killing anyone, with dialogue instead of violence.

Some Marxist intellectuals were among the most active critics against the consideration of this group of companies as a real utopia. As is common in dogmatic ideologists, they have not comprehensively read the most important books of their referents. Althusser co-authored "To read the Capital" [44] without having read "The Capital" [45]. Most dogmatic Marxists have never read "The Capital" and have instead read books based on Althusser's perspective, which are presented in today's press as the best interpretation of Marxism. Marxist intellectuals doing "Marxist" critique to cooperativism get surprised when real intellectuals show them Marx's words about it, for instance in The Capital [46] itself, or in the Inaugural Address of the Working Men's International Association [47]:

> "But there was in store a still greater victory of the political economy of labour over the political economy of property. We speak of the co-operative movement, especially of the co-operative factories raised by the unassisted efforts of a few bold 'hands'. The value of these great social experiments cannot be overrated. By deed, instead of by argument, they have shown that production on a large scale, and in accord with the behest of modern science, may be carried on without the existence of a class of masters employing a class of hands; that to bear fruit, the means of labour need not be monopolised as a means of dominion over, and of extortion against, the labouring man himself; and that, like slave labour, like serf labour, hired labour is but a transitory and inferior form, destined to disappear before associated labour plying its toil with a willing hand, a ready mind, and a joyous heart".

Incapable of sustaining a real theoretical debate about the matter without losing their false image of being rigorous intellectuals, some social theorists try to orient this kind of research programmes to the promotion of ideological statements. They criticise those cooperatives because they do not exactly follow the ideological principles that they decide, such as the rejection of economic success and the 100% of workers being members of the cooperative, with no one being salaried. These ideological criteria exclude

those cooperative companies that are creating more equality in the world, like the Mondragon Group, because for example some of those companies have both kinds of workers: owners and salaried. At the end, this ideological lens only allows the inclusion of those kinds of cooperatives which do not have economic success and subsist on the self-exploitation of workers in precarious situations and/or on the funding from the public budget. These ideologists see themselves as the intellectuals who know how to overcome the inequalities of capitalism; not only have they never overcome any inequality, but they only criticise those who do.

The most successful scientific research projects have studied successful cooperativism like the one of the Mondragon Group. They are the ones having success in transforming the economy and society and having social impact [48]. Nevertheless, cooperatives are not the only kind of companies experiencing dialogic transformations and having social impact, they are very diverse. In order to have a truthful picture of the improvement of society generated by some companies, a scientific analysis of the effects of their activities in society is necessary, which is impossible to do from any kind of ideological dogmatism. For instance, the dogmatist lens avoids seeing that many workers do not want to be owners of the cooperatives, and any effort to force them to be what they do not want to be is an aggression to the workers' rights and freedom.

Dialogic sociologies make those analyses so needed by society and by science. Their studies are not limited to the very easy and useless task of "clarifying" that there are also inequalities and other problems in those companies; everybody knows this, it is not necessary to waste time on this "clarification". Instead, dialogic sociologies focus on two very intelligent and useful tasks. On the one hand, they clarify both the inequalities and other problems of those successful companies and the steps they have taken to approach the egalitarian dreams of workers and of wider society. On the other hand, those sociologies clarify the transferability of some of the actions implemented by those companies to other and diverse companies; in so doing, those studies are having a social impact in the increase of success of diverse companies, including their social impact in reducing inequalities. Among dialogic sociologists there are not only scientists. Many of them are professionals who have an incredible social impact in very diverse fields. In

the case of companies, they are even able to manage them, leading all workers to success. Of course, this is not possible for those sociologists that only know how to do the very easy and useless activity of criticising what others do while doing nothing by themselves.

Can sociologists manage successful companies? They can and they do. There are an increasing number of dialogic sociologists managing very successful companies, successful in values, in overcoming inequalities and in economic results. Even the creator of the Mondragon group is considered a sociologist who used to promote reading and debates about theoretical books on social theory. Some people say he was not a sociologist because he never got a degree in sociology, but with this argument authors like Durkheim and Weber are not sociologists either. In the current society, the management of many companies needs special competencies to organise and promote the internal dialogues among workers and external dialogue with clients and the wider society. Dialogic sociologists are very much able to manage them, and they are already doing it, achieving more social impact, generating a greater overcoming of inequalities than traditional social scientists criticising everything others do without doing anything.

Dialogic person

We do not engage in dialogue only with human beings in face-to-face or online contact, but we have also reached inner speech with human beings who are not present now, even those who already died, with whom we interacted in the past. Many authors consider "Ulysses" by James Joyce [49] to be the best contemporary novel. It is dedicated to the inner speech of a man very different from the main character of "The Odyssey", who even challenges the Gods. He is a common citizen of the beginning of the 20th century. The last of the eighteen chapters is his wife's monologue, her inner speech. Leopold Bloom has inner speech with diverse human beings, but also with Stephen, a character related to himself when he was young. Humans have inner speech even with ourselves, including when we were younger than now.

The people who have been in our lives are part of our persons; even if we have already forgotten them, they are at least an almost negligible ingredient of what we are now and will be in the future. Proust's madeleine (from another of the greatest contemporary novels: "In Search of Lost Time" [50]) is very famous. When Swann tasted a madeleine soaked in tea, he felt an emotion that transported him to a memory he had forgotten but was part of his persona: that taste was the same as the madeleine his aunt used to give him when he was a child.

There are authors, like Bakhtin [51,52], who have made interesting contributions related to this matter. The interpretation of a text is a process of dialogic imagination: every time we read a sentence, our interpretation of it is not only linked to the words in that text, but it is linked to all the conversations we have had with very different people and to the conversations we will have in the future. Wright Mills [53], with the concept of sociological imagination, tries to understand and clarify the relation between the self and society, taking into account the connections between the particular social environments of individuals and the wider social forces; he said that neither the life of any individual nor the history of society can be understood without understanding them both.

George Herbert Mead [54] elaborated the concept of "self", which included the "I" and the "me". He very well clarified that the "me" results from the generalised other. He raised the example of a sports team: the generalised other is what results from the interaction with the whole team more than with each individual. He did not clarify in the same manner the concept of "I", although it is the reaction of the organism to the "me". This current conception of the dialogic person goes beyond Mead's one thanks to the incredible recent discoveries by sciences such as the neural sciences.

Swann, tasting the madeleine, remembers his aunt, an individual person instead of a generalised other. Bloom interacts in his inner speech with many and diverse individuals, they are not part of a team, some of them do not even know each other. The person results from multiple and diverse external and internal dialogues with individuals and teams. All those dialogues interact with the person's brain. The brain, as Kandel says [55], not only reacts to those dialogues but is also continuously modified by them.

One of the consequences of interactions for the dialogic person is the configuration of their desires. Many teenagers develop a desire to smoke as a consequence of their dialogues with their peers and the media. This desire gains intensity when it generates the action of smoking and sometimes it creates dependency. Frequently, this slave desire is in contradiction with the free desire people have to not harm their own health. The will, the power of choosing and deciding, is the key people have to liberate themselves from the slave desires and freely choose their lives.

The beautiful opera "Ariane et barbe-bleue" has a very impressive ending that clarifies the configuration of desires through the dialogic person. When Ariane discovers that the five previous wives of his husband are not dead, but enchained and imprisoned, she decides to commit herself to their liberation. When she offers to liberate them, they do not want to be free and decide to remain imprisoned. Ariane shows them the beauty of freedom and tells them very nice words: "Look at the door, it is open, and fields have blue tones (…) The moon and the stars illuminate the paths. The forest and the sea are calling us from afar and dawn extends onto the blue dome to show us a world flooded with hope" [56]. They decide to remain chained and Ariane escapes alone.

It is not easy for persons to free their own self from the submission they have been socialised into by the coercive discourse [57]. Many young girls have explained in interviews to feminist researchers what happens to many of them. The following is about one of them who, in this book, I call Alladine (a character of the abovementioned opera). She did not like at all her first disdainful hookup and the boy she had it with, but the coercive discourse pressed her into saying that this hookup was very exciting, and the boy was handsome. She interiorised a slave memory linked to a slave desire.

This interpretation played several functions. Before she had the first disdainful hookup, her group of friends had already had disdainful hookups with boys who said they were easy girls, a reputation that reached the entire high school. On the contrary, she was considered the most attractive girl. This situation changed when her first disdainful hookup was quickly spread in the school, then she was classified like the others, as an easy girl. The

thought that the boy was attractive gave her the idea that she was also attractive that night, and she needed this since weeks before her boyfriend had broken up with her. This slave desire made her submissive to new disdainful hookups and to following her friends in classifying the bad boys in what they called the "fuckzone" and the egalitarian boys in the "friendzone". She felt like in a prison and having to pretend happiness while somatisation was creating physical health problems. Tears appeared in her face when she listened for the first time to a song of the Cuarenta Principales (Spanish radio program) that says: "Partying nights become bitter. I laugh unwillingly with a smile painted on my face" [58].

When she learned evidence about the coercion suffered by teenagers to socialise them in the disdainful hookups and the cruel attacks to those who reject them, she could identify many details about the coercion she suffered. The narratives gathered in scientific research via interviews and discussion groups with teenagers participating in disdainful hookups unveil the process of how such coercion occurs. In one of our scientific articles about this matter [59], we share quotations from a discussion group held with five 15- and 16-year-old girls in which they explained their practice to convince a friend who has a boyfriend to go out with them to a disco and push her to talk to a boy there. Then, these "friends" take pictures of the interaction, and select one where it might look like the boy is kissing and/or touching the girl, even though that is not the case. The group of "friends" sends the picture to the girl's boyfriend as well as to the popular boys in their high school. The adolescents laughed while explaining this in the discussion group, even when saying that "That photo will be there all your life, it will be eating at you until you die. The photo will even be in your grave". Afterwards, the group shared: "Some people end up committing suicide because it hurts so much." This socialisation in cruelty generates inner speech which plays a relevant role in the personality of many persons, both of aggressors and victims. Disdainful hookups are now one of the most powerful socialisations in bad relationships and in the incapacity to enjoy good relationships.

This coercion is crueller against those girls that have made the free choice of falling in love with a boy who is also in love with them and with whom they are living an ideal love. Harassers impose an image of conservatism on these girls, while the ones submissive to them would be the ones "liberated" from

tradition. The reality is just the opposite to those images. Before the extension and democratisation of ideal love, women were forced to have sexual relationships (*droit du seigneur*) with the lord of the territory; only later she could get married. An increasing number of women and men rebelled against this imposition and could choose which person to share an ideal love with. What harassers name "liberation" is a new form *droit du seigneur*, they press all girls from high school to have sex with the boys self-classified in the "fuckzone", and those who rebel against this imposition and are in love with egalitarian boys receive the aggressions as the ones previously explained.

This coercive discourse is also imposed on boys by their friends. In an interview for scientific research about consent, a 15-year-old said: "At the beginning of making out with someone it was like I felt very uncomfortable and pressured... At that time, I did feel that pressure: 'I've been with 4, I've been with 5, I've been with 7...eh...I've been with 0...'". Another from the same age said: "So it's like before when you're for example at the disco dancing there or so... or before leaving... 'Tonight a *putivuelta* [a whore tour]' ... And it's like you're already hunting for people... I mean you're checking to see what's there that night to see what you can take home or what you can't take home."

Later, Alladine found in scientific articles evidence about the dialogic reconstruction of memory, a path to question slave desires because the slave memory generates slave images, and the slave images generate slave desire. She decided to freely be the girl she desired to be. Her slave desire was a strong chain. She now says the effort she needed to liberate herself from it was like the effort others need to liberate themselves from addictions like tobacco or heroin. She went to her old diary and what she read was different from the internal images she had of that night. Since her boyfriend suddenly abandoned her at that moment, what she wrote was clearly a self-image of not being attractive at all and incapable of getting any attractive boy to fall in love with her. The diary of those days was a clear proof of the use of the coercive discourse by her group of friends saying she could have hookups in the disco with much more attractive boys than her former boyfriend and than any egalitarian boys they classified in the "friendzone". They pressed her so much that they even came to her home to dress and do her make-up in an

"adequate" way to succeed in the disco. That night, after taking a compulsive shower, she wrote about how ugly she felt, the pain she had during the hookup, the boy's lack of acceptance to stop, the shame for the possibility that someone would tape and distribute it on the social media, the indignation for the comments the boy and his friends would make about her. The diary was not opened again after that night, no more words were written, no more words were read until she decided to reconstruct the truth.

She talked a lot about all this with two close friends and day by day the slave memory was more in contradiction with what really happened. She took a compulsive shower trying to clean her body from any remnant of this nauseating experience. In order to forget the painful internal image of the disdainful hookup she accepted the coercive discourse of her group of friends. In the true image, she felt ugly and submissive to a sexist boy. In the slaving image, she felt attractive and having success with an attractive boy. This slave memory forced her to repeat the same kind of hookups several times and classify egalitarian boys in the "friendzone". Her dialogues with the two close friends about many details proved the falseness of this slave memory. They talked about how girls that feel beautiful do not have those disdainful hookups, they do not "need" them to feel attractive. Her hookups were at four or five in the morning, when the boys that have not succeeded during the entire night look for what they call the "left-over girls".

Unlike the Alladine of the opera, this Alladine could change the slave memory with a true memory: the disdainful hookups with sexist dirty boys were changed by free hookups with egalitarian attractive boys. Because of the link between the slave desire and the slave memory, only the person can freely decide if she wants to reconstruct her memory, no one can decide for her, neither should anyone decide for her; she is the only one to decide freely with whom she wants to dialogue about that process. This free election is key because, as the concept of Dialogue of Memories [60] clarifies, human memories are continuously interacting with one another, transforming themselves.

The dialogic reconstruction of memory [61] overcomes coerced images, which generates a liberation of desires. This dialogic reconstruction of memory has two characteristics: the first is dialogue with trusting friends and

the second is the inclusion of the scientific evidence in this dialogue. Discovering the falseness of the internal slave images is not enough to liberate the dependence from them; the dialogue with friends to facilitate the reconstruction of the true internal images requires making free decisions without any kind of coercion, in this case about the sexual-affective relationships she desires to have or not have.

Dialogue made and makes us humans

Dialogue is not only at the basis of the foundation of social sciences but also at the very origins of humankind. There have been theories that have placed the key to human evolution in the handling of tools that correlates with changes in the body, such as the upright position or the development of the brain. However, nobody invents a tool individually and alone, it has always been done in interaction with others. The move from gestures to communication by signs or symbols was decisive. When smoke signals communicate something other than the fact there is fire, it is because human beings have agreed on their meaning. Diverse cultures have used smoke signals to communicate important things like imminent danger, victory, or defeat. Still very recently or even now certain bell sounds are used in a rural area to announce a fire, a death, or a birth. Certain sounds were transformed into words through this type of consensus, thus creating the verbal language that has been so important in our development, so much that the also very important role of other forms of communication has sometimes been forgotten or relegated to.

Although we often do not do so consciously, we are currently using these different conceptions of humankind's evolution. When we are told that the key to learning written language is the relationship of the child with the book, we are applying the idea that what is important is the relationship of the individual with the tool. However, this relationship between the child and the book is the result of the child's relationships with other people that have led him/her to love or reject certain books. For this reason, some of the most successful actions in encouraging motivation to read the best books are dialogue groups about those works. Even if the child is not fortunate enough to participate in such groups, a child who is surrounded by others who are

motivated to talk about the best books will have a very favourable context in which to develop this motivation.

Through dialogue we became human beings and through dialogue humanity is elaborating its own objectives, such as the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). One of the frequent criticisms in this sense, which is partly justified, is that only a minority of citizens have participated in the drafting and decision-making of the SDGs. However, this does not mean that they are not the result of dialogue, even if it is still a limited dialogue. What it is certain is that the SDGs are not the result of an individual person creating or operating a tool, that is, they are not the result of an individual writing on a piece of paper or a computer. Another example is democracy; like all the best ideas, the idea of democracy is wonderful. Still, it can only be realised with limitations which, in turn, have been partially overcome throughout history, and a growing number of people and organisations are working to take further steps. Those who, instead of working to improve those objectives only see their imperfections, are not sufficiently critical and intelligent to recognise that they and their relationships are not perfect either.

Plato told us that we could not see the ideas, but only the shadows of the ideas. Even if this were so, these imperfect shadows are what allow us to have knowledge, and thus, approach the perfect ideas that we cannot see. Thomas More [62] and other authors have preferred to place the ideal in a utopia that we will never reach, but which shows us the path we must follow if we want to get closer to it, that is, to improve our lives. Phenomenologists and other authors have preferred the idea of a horizon that we can reach, but once there, we see that it has moved away again, and so, we can have another horizon that guides us on how to continue improving. Poet Antonio Machado [63] tells us that "there is no path, the path is made by walking".

In any case, not only the steps we take towards ideals, but the very elaboration of those ideals has been, is, and will be dialogic. Democracy, friendship, love, freedom, and equality are values that we human beings have elaborated in interaction with each other and continually re-elaborate, also through dialogue.

Frequently, the conception of dialogue is reduced to words, but everybody knows many other forms of dialogue: body language, signs language, music language; for instance, diverse authors have promoted, analysed, and painted the idea of "talking hands", like Kokoschka's portrait of Rudolf Blümner. The reduction of communication to words involves, among other consequences, that we cannot know whether speech acts like "yes" mean yes or something else, unless we analyse the diverse dimensions of such communicative act, from which the speech act "yes" is a subset. For example, there are conceptions and even legislations that want to solve such a complex issue as sexual consent with words alone. In this sense, they have evolved from "no means no" to "only yes means yes". However, scientific research has already shown that consent can only be solved by contemplating the globality of the communicative acts and not only the speech acts. A "yes" with a knife in the neck is not a yes. Limiting all signs of communication to words alone is reductionism. Words are indispensable, but they are only part of the signs of communication we need for our existence and to improve our lives.

In order to understand the diverse interpretations of the concept of dialogue (dia-logos), it is important to analyse its historical evolution. The Greek "dia" can be translated as "through". The main problem is the conception of "logos". Greek philosopher Heraclites understood logos to be the principle that guides the evolution of everything. From this original and holistic conception, dialogue includes all human dimensions like reason and desire. Later, from Socrates until now, the reduction of the conception of logos to reason has been dominant. This is part of a reductionism to the Apollonian dimension of life without including the Dionysian dimension. Apollo is the god of sun linked to reason and order, while Dionysus is the god of wine and dance, linked to passion and emotion (although many people attribute this conception to Nietzsche, it is much older). Both supporters and critics of rationality have shared the same reductionistic concept: supporters (like Kant, Marx, Habermas) defending rationality and critics (like Nietzsche, Heidegger, Foucault) attacking rationality. As part of this dominant thinking reducing logos to reason, philosophy of language has developed very interesting and useful perspectives, such as Austin's speech acts. His idea of "How to do things with words" [64] clarifies the increasing role of words in

current societies: even a short word like "yes", depending on the context, can create an institution, marriage.

Yet the concept of speech acts limits our vision of human communication to words, to verbal language, excluding other languages that are also important for desires, emotions, sentiments, and feelings as is body language. This is not the same reductionism as the concept of rationality, but they are connected. More recent developments of social sciences have clarified the concept of communicative acts, which includes all dimensions of dialogue with all types of languages (words, gestures, looks, caresses) and with all types of meanings (intellectual, sexual, commercial). In doing so, the insight of communicative acts makes a great contribution to the overcoming of the two traditional reductionisms of life: the Kantian Apollonian reductionism and the Nietzschean Dionysian reductionism.

Dialogue made and makes us human beings with ideas and emotions, arguments and sentiments, values and desires. The two mentioned reductionisms make it impossible to understand human beings and to facilitate them to improve their lives. The concept of speech acts is focused on ideas, arguments, and values, and clearly does not take into account emotions, sentiments, and desires. The concept of communicative acts considers all dimensions of the human life, it is very fruitful in the analysis of dialogue and of society, and it allows human beings to improve their lives.

1001 dimensions of dialogue

While humanity has created extraordinary knowledge about the universe, this is only a minuscule part of what we still have to discover, and we will probably never discover everything. While humanity has created extraordinary knowledge about dialogue, this is only a minuscule part of what we still have to discover and probably we will never discover everything. The most intelligent attitude is to be open to new discoveries that can complement, or even refute, what we already know, and simultaneously use the provisional knowledge today available to improve science and society. The move from speech acts to communicative acts is not like moving from geocentrism to heliocentrism; this move does not refute the

contributions of speech acts theory, but it rather includes them. The theory of communicative acts opens up the horizon of speech acts to the unlimited dimensions of dialogue. Therefore, it is not similar to the move from geocentrism to heliocentrism, but to the move from heliocentrism to the current conception of the universe with many suns.

If we take a look at our memory, we can recall many moments in which we had excellent human communication without words. We also know that in any face-to-face human interaction there are other signs of communication besides words. Even when we talk by phone, there are other signs, such as the tone of the voice or the silences, which sometimes say more than the actual words. Neuroscience and other sciences are recently making wonderful contributions to the analysis and improvement of these unlimited dimensions of human communication.

When legislation, policies and/or the messages that go along with them do not take into account the main contributions of social sciences and humanities, they make mistakes, creating unintended consequences that go in the opposite direction to what citizens and policy makers pretend. This is the case of the mentioned slogans "No means no" or "only yes means yes".

Austin goes beyond the distinction between language and words with his three concepts of *locutionary, illocutionary* and *perlocutionary* speech acts. I will not repeat those concepts here because it is impossible to do it better than Austin's writings, and those are available for anybody. For ease of clarification, some readers of the draft of this book have asked me to include examples, which are not exactly of Austin's concepts but are related to them, in order to clarify the utility of their distinctions for practical life. *Locutionary* is related to the transmission of semantic content in an utterance independently of the interaction between speaker and listener; for instance, the sentence "fun people go outside". *Illocutionary* includes the intention of the speaker to get an understanding with the listener; for instance, the speaker may say "fun people go outside" to several friends with the unique intention to express an opinion, without trying to convince them to go out, and even himself not wanting to do so. *Perlocutionary* includes the production of an effect upon the listener; for instance, the speaker says "fun people go

outside" within an interaction in a disco producing in the listener the effect that if she does not go outside to hook up with him, she is not fun but boring.

Habermas made some errors, which limited his very valuable efforts to enrich Austin's linguistic theory of speech acts with the sociological analysis of power and validity. The feminist former President of the European Sociological Association Marta Soler and her colleagues have made a step forward that is relevant for any current theory of consent. They have complemented Austin's theory with a rigorous analysis of the current dialogic society from the perspective of all sciences (not only social sciences). The first contribution has been to widen the approach from a linguistic theory of speech acts to an interdisciplinary, holistic theory of communicative acts. Human communication is not only through words, but there are also many other dimensions such as glances or body movements. In order to comprehend human communication, we should analyse all communicative acts and not only the subset of speech acts.

Dialogic theories are based on the diverse and interdisciplinary contributions about power and communication which have been extraordinarily developed in the current century. They are inspired by Austin's contributions but do not follow their concrete concepts. The same words have different meanings in a context of power or in a context of relationships based on consensus. The locution "It's time for coffee" among friends with egalitarian relationships is different from the same locution pronounced by a company manager to the girl he is interviewing in a selection process as one of the job candidates. In the former case, the locution includes the illocutionary intention for others to understand he wants to have coffee; the perlocutionary effect is to ask them to freely decide whether they want or do not want to go with him for coffee. In the latter case, the locution includes the illocutionary intention for her to understand he wants to have coffee; intentionally or not, the power relation due to the hierarchical structure of the workplace generates the perlocutionary effect for her to feel pressured to accept to have coffee with him.

The theory of communicative acts has clarified that "yes" means yes in the context of dialogic communicative acts, but "yes" does not mean yes in the context of power communicative acts. Differently to power communicative

acts, the dialogic communicative acts are free of violence: physical, institutional, or interactive. Physical violence includes both its use against the person saying "yes" as well as the threat to do so, for instance showing a knife or six boys cornering a girl in a hallway. Institutional violence includes the link between saying "yes" or "no" and receiving consequences from those who have the institutional power to decide this, such as to pass or fail an exam or to be promoted or losing the job in a company. Interactive violence is used by those who have interactive power to provoke negative consequences, such as bullying by others, if one of his victims says no.

Dialogic theories include in the word *illocutionary* only the understanding of the locution by the speaker and the listener: when the speaker says, "I want a date with you", the listener understands what the speaker wants. This is just understanding the proposal, it does not mean that the listener agrees or not. Understanding is one of the requirements for agreement. For instance, a boy says to a girl in a disco "let's go out for a walk". The girl asks, "It's only for walking, nothing else?". The boy answers, "yes, yes". They go outside and the boy kisses and touches her. The "yes" to going out is not consented, because there was not a common understanding of the boy's proposal. But common understanding is not enough; free decision without any kind of coercion is required. If once outside the boy proposes her to have sex through a communicative act which includes showing her a knife there is a common understanding, but not an agreement, because even if she said yes, it is not a free yes.

The theory of communicative acts clarifies that the condition for consent is not just illocutionary speech, but free of any violence. In this perspective, the concept of illocutionary is useful to analyse whether an utterance in the form of a proposal allows the listener to exactly understand it or not. For instance, when the girl asks him "It's only for walking, nothing else?", if the boy intends to kiss and touch her, he should say this clearly for the answer to be an illocutionary speech act. If he answers "yes, yes" cheating in his intention, this speech act is not illocutionary and, hence, there is no agreement, because the acceptance of the proposal by the girl is not about what he is trying to provoke. This kind of analysis provides clear elements for clarification, in trials and in everyday life, on whether a speech act like "yes" is or it is not consent.

For a communicative act to be dialogic, it should be free of perlocutionary effects that one of the participants or both do not want. This raises a difficult question: the participant is not only responsible for his intention, but also for the consequences. With his best intention, a boss can propose having coffee to a job candidate, but maybe she feels obliged to accept it. The boss may have the only intention of having coffee, but he should know that his institutional power can have this coerced effect. In order to avoid these situations, some universities forbid any sexual relationship between a professor and a student before taking an exam. Others do not forbid this relationship, but their norms make the professor aware that if she reports him, the university will support her, because he is not only responsible for not pressuring her but for avoiding making her feel pressured.

III. THE BEAUTY OF HUMAN CREATIONS

Poetry, science, and rights. Sappho and Scheherazade

The poet Sappho already established the link between beauty and goodness: "what is beautiful is good, and who is good will soon also be beautiful" [65]. Einstein related beauty to science: "Pure mathematics is, in its way, the poetry of logical ideas" [66]. The mathematical concept of "golden ratio" was considered key for beauty; all dimensions of Botticelli's Venus keep this golden ratio. Any citizen being introduced into musical language learns that pieces are divided into measures, measures are divided into beats, and beats can be further divided by notes of particular values, and some composers like Mozart, Beethoven or Brahms used the golden ratio as the basis of the form of some of their music works [67]. Nigerian architect Miriam Kamara stated: "Design can be a powerful tool for good" [68]. Beauty, truth, and goodness are linked in real life and in the words of the best authors. Some people think the three glances are the same reality, others consider they are separate dimensions but with links among them.

Sappho also linked truth to beauty and goodness. She was the founder of the first known school for women over twenty-six centuries ago, while most women had no access to schools two centuries ago. She also said the truth outlining the good values and sentiments of some women and also of some men, instead of promoting the hoax that all men are potential aggressors [69]:

> He seems to me equal to the gods that man
> whoever he is who opposite you
> sits and listens close
> to your sweet speaking
> and lovely laughing — oh it
> puts the heart in my chest on wings
> for when I look at you, even a moment, no
> speaking
> is left in me
> no: tongue breaks and thin
> fire is racing under skin
> and in eyes no sight and drumming
> fills ears
> and cold sweat holds me and shaking

> grips me all, greener than grass
> I am and dead — or almost
> I seem to me.

Twenty-six centuries later, some journalists and some authors in the social sciences and humanities act against the truth; they promote hoaxes such as that all men are potential aggressors, ignoring that in cases of gender violence there are women and men in favour of the victim and men and women in favour of aggressors. Frequently, it is said and written that Mary Wollstonecraft is the precursor of women's rights, because she wrote a book about this theme in 1792.

This wrong statement makes authors who wrote before about this, making authors such as (female) Olympe de Gouges (1791) and (male) Nicolas de Condorcet (1790) [70] invisible. The same year, 1790, in which Condorcet published a book about women's rights, the book published by Mary Wollstonecraft had the title "A Vindication of the Rights of Men" [71]. Luckily, the Diario Feminista, the only feminist newspaper that comes out every day of the year, clarified this question, overcoming the mistake made in the main newspapers [72].

The dreams of most citizens embrace the three dimensions, they like or they would like to enjoy beauty and truth and goodness. The dominant power discourses oppose those dreams and socialise people in order to reject one of those dimensions and/or the unity of them. The imposition of fake against truth, badness against goodness, and ugliness against beauty creates a lack of trust in society and harms wellbeing and health. The arts, the sciences, and the rights are resources created by humanity in order to keep dreams alive and lighten up the steps approaching reality to them.

Sappho was one of the authors who made a great revolution of literature. In the context of epic tales like "The Iliad" and "The Odyssey", she was one of the creators of lyric literature. Instead of exalting men who killed humans as heroes, her poems make peaceful women and men shine their sentiments instead of their guns. Humans create social realities and humans like Sappho create them through their poetry. Plato considered her as the tenth muse.

We can discuss as much as we like if love tales are the mirrors that reflect the human love sentiments or, the other way around, love sentiments spring when they are watered by love tales. What we know clearly is that both walk together. The beauty of some poems, paintings, music, and other artistic creations are at the same time a reflection of the beauty of some human relationships and the creation of beautiful relationships. Their influence goes much beyond the people that read or contemplate them, because they share these sentiments with other persons with whom they have relationships. The lives of some poets are not examples of the love sentiments described in their writings. As far as we know, that is not the case of Sappho and many other excellent poets and persons. She was and is an example of the freedom of any person to have consensual sexual relationships with the persons she or he decides.

Sappho did not separate beauty from goodness ("what is beautiful is good") and, when it was separated by others, she claimed for recovering their integration ("who is good will soon also be beautiful"). The goodness of many and diverse people throughout history has created and continuously re-elaborates human rights, which includes the right to participate in scientific advance and in its benefits. Sappho is clearly a precursor of this right to science with the school she founded. Humans improve the lives of humanity through their own creations like poetry, science, and rights.

In all parts of the world, we find excellent women who are still today and will even be more so in the future as symbols of the beauty of humans. Some of them, like Sappho, are clearly women who have existed historically, and we have little or much information about their lives. Others are created by human tales, like Scheherazade, although they make a free version of the reflection of the lives of one or several real existing women.

Although the names of these outstanding women have been frequently used in a very sexist way, feminist scientists have cleaned their images and clarified their very relevant contributions to humanity. Unfortunately, Western culture has not vindicated the image of Scheherazade as much of the one of Sappho. Still now, some people identify Scheherazade as a name of roadside whorehouses and many persons reduce her to a sexually subdued body. One needs not read much about her to know that she was a very

intelligent, cultured, revolutionary, feminist, and solidary woman. It is enough, for instance, to read this quote: "Scheherazade had perused the books, annals, and legends of preceding Kings, and the stories, examples, and instances of bygone men and things; indeed, it was said that she had collected a thousand books of histories relating to antique races and departed rulers." [73]

Scheherazade has been made visible by feminists as an extraordinary intellectual and sexy woman, who put the art of seduction at the service of solidarity among women in publications such as the article dedicated to her in the Diario Feminista [74]. From different ideologies we still see the denial of women's freedom to be, if they like, intellectual and sexy. A modern case is the invisibilisation of Hedy Lamarr, who created technology that made the WIFI we use today possible. At the same time, she was also a sexy film actress and fighter against Nazism, a woman who socially represents one of the versions of the unity between truth, beauty, and goodness. Luckily, an increasing number of feminist teachers from diverse ideologies are now making her visible.

Salma, a nine-year-old girl from a very low socioeconomic context, loves to read and engage in dialogue around "The Arabian Nights" [73] and others among the best literary books with her classmates. She is much more far-sighted in this matter than many intellectuals: "What I like most is the character of Scheherazade because she is a woman who saves the lives of many women... Now I don't know if I prefer Circe or Scheherazade...". Salma and her classmates were impressed by Scheherazade's peaceful and solidarity-based heroism in contrast to the violent profile of most men presented like heroes by epic literature. They read and have profound dialogues about words like these: "For Allah, Father, marry me to this man. Either I shall live or else I shall be a ransom for the children of the Muslims and save them from him.' 'By God,' he exclaimed, 'you are not to risk your life!' She insisted that it be done…"

Many intellectuals were very impressed when getting to know one of the more than 15.000 Dialogic Literary Gatherings worldwide [75] which allow a taste for beauty in spite of the weeds created and imposed by the business of children's socialisation into ugly taste. Children (and adults) participating

in these successful cultural actions enjoy directly reading and engaging in dialogues about books like "Arabian Nights", "Rayuela" by Julio Cortázar, "The Waves" by Virginia Woolf, "Ramayana" or "Ulysses" by James Joyce.

In 2000, Nobel Prize laureate in Literature José Saramago wrote about this movement: "I like to know that these Literary Gatherings interest people so much and they are so successful (…) your work plan is extraordinary and necessary to bring awareness about people's individuality in a society that we try to make more and more solidary". Eduardo Galeano wrote these words: "You confirm, by doing what you do, that writing is not a useless passion, and that this tentative of communion is worthwhile (...) I am confident that Onetti and Joyce are very happy to be here, conversing with you, alive in the words they wrote and the books they left to us".

An excellent dissertation at the University of Deusto analysed the social impact of dialogic literary gatherings with three groups of people with psychosis, including people with schizophrenia, 23 in total. The improvement in their health and all dimensions of their lives is incredible. It is very moving to see how they debate whether Gregorio Samsa is (or not) a person with schizophrenia. Health professionals had doubts about whether it was a good idea to start by reading and dialoguing "The Metamorphosis" by Kafka, but they are now convinced that those dialogic literary gatherings are one of the best successful actions for many persons in a situation of psychosis. They have already reduced the medication of some of them. Several decades ago, there was an intensive debate against medication proposing social treatments but without contributing with concrete successful actions which have scientifically demonstrated people's improvement. Successful actions like dialogic literary gatherings have contributed to the improvement of those persons much more than the mentioned debate. Linda Hargreaves, senior professor of Cambridge and member of the committee of the evaluation of the dissertation, asked at dinner: "Did you expect those relevant results when you founded the dialogic literary gatherings?" [76].

The policy impact of this socialisation in beauty is also impressive and has contributed significantly to elevating the criterion of co-creation to the level of requirement in research programs in all scientific areas. A ten-year-old

girl from one of the schools with lowest socioeconomic status impressed the audience in the headquarters of the European Parliament with her address: "When we read The Odyssey, we saw the Trojan War from the point of view of the Greek. Now we are reading The Aeneid, and we see it from the point of view of the Trojans. This is helping us understand wars better". The member of the Parliament who was sharing the panel with her (Simon Busuttil) explained: "This is probably one of the best speeches I have ever listened to in this Parliament since 2004. Congratulations Ania! I believe that sometimes politicians need to be silent and listen, especially when we listen to this type of explanations; I believe that all of us were asking ourselves: 'I was not so good when I was ten!'" [77].

Most intellectuals cannot be impressed by the same words as Salma, because they have never read "The Arabian Nights", Sappho's poems, and others among the best literary books, which are now being read and shared in dialogue by an increasing number of children, including the ones from the poorest areas and from different parts of the world. Among those professors who have never achieved any social improvement with their research and with the theories of which they are followers, there are very varied reactions to these successful actions. On the one hand, there are those who admire them and support them in everything they can and are enabled to. On the other hand, there are those who see the only thing they have achieved throughout their career, their prestige, their professional promotion, and their economic remuneration threatened; these do not use their time and words in trying to do better in the future, but in making up all kinds of criticisms and attacks against those who do achieve social improvements.

The first Dialogic Literary Gathering was founded in a worker's area of Barcelona, in 1979, where there were still many shacks [78]. It was part of a dream of the neighbourhood, developed bottom-up by citizens, which included education, health, elder care, urbanism, ecology, social inclusion. The dream included a library that was first settled in a flat of the same building as other parts of the dream and has later been moved to an independent and new building, which outlines how beautiful architecture can be when it takes into account the artist's idea and citizens' bottom-up ideas. Helen Gould Shepard Professor of Social Science at NYU Eric Klinenberg [79] published a tweet on September 22, 2022, saying: "The Gabriel Garcia

Marquez Library just opened in a working-class neighbourhood in Barcelona. It's magical. It's real. And it's the kind of place that makes you wonder why every city doesn't give its residents palaces for the people". On October 2, 2022, this tweet had 8,119 retweets and 60,500 likes. The dream and the actions to get it were led first by the egalitarian dialogue between citizens and one sociologist, and later also with other scientists from different fields of knowledge.

Sappho and Scheherazade are only two examples of the many persons who have improved human sentiments with their poetry. Some of them are famous and have their writings published in books. Many others have maintained their poetry in the private circle of the people they love and even only in their own intimacy. There are also persons who, regardless of whether they have written poems or not, have transformed their own lives into poetry, giving their sentiments, their love, and their friendship to their closest persons.

Poetry, science, and rights. Copernicus and Karikó

Copernicus initiated in 1543 the most well-known scientific revolution, which commonly receives the name of the Copernican Revolution. "De Revolutionibus" [80] is a book in which we can read mathematical as well as aesthetic arguments in favour of heliocentrism, which he himself had previously disseminated: "At rest, however, in the middle of everything is the sun. For in this most beautiful temple, who would place this lamp in another or better position than that from which it can light up the whole thing at the same time?"

The people who do not know the clear links between science and beauty are surprised when they realise that one of the main arguments by the author to defend his heliocentric Universe was its beauty. In fact, he did not proclaim that the real Universe was like the one he built with his extraordinary mathematical calculations. Instead, he stated that the stars' movement was more foreseeable by the heliocentric Universe and was more beautiful, closer to Divine perfection. Many centuries later, Marie Skłodowska Curie said, "I am among those who think that science has great beauty. A scientist in the

laboratory is not only a technician, she/he is also a child placed before a natural phenomenon, which impresses her/him like a fairy tale." Sciences like sociology also value beauty. For instance, Elster's book "Alchemies of the Mind" [81] outlines the importance of literature for the social sciences' analysis of emotions.

In 2021, the European Sociological Association (ESA) approved for the first time a norm against sexual violence and isolating gender violence. Most victims of gender violence cannot report and become survivors without support, and most bystanders do not support because of the fear of retaliation [82]. Harassers develop a cruel isolating gender violence against upstanders in order to isolate their victims [83]. An indispensable requirement to overcome gender violence is to condemn isolating gender violence by parliaments in legislations and by organisations in their statutes and ethical codes. The Catalan and the Basque parliament have already approved such a legislation and now I am advising the Brazilian parliament in its process to do so. In the abovementioned ESA conference, a large audience applauded the verses of the play that García Lorca dedicated to the young revolutionary woman Mariana Pineda [84], recited by a female young sociologist accompanied by a grand piano played by a sociologist who is currently a Professor of Higher Degree in Music in Catalonia:

Women in prison:
I don't understand!
She is a good woman
and they want to kill her
What do you say?
I wish I could look closely at her heart
for a long while.
What a brave woman!
Yesterday when they came to read her
death sentence, she did not hide her smile.
O, Marianita Pineda!
The flowers' that will
accompany you in death
are opening.

Mariana:
It cannot be! Cowards! And who orders
such atrocities in Spain?

What right do the police have?
In that flag of liberty, I embroidered
the greatest love of my life.
Am I to remain here imprisoned?
O, to have clear crystal wings
To fly in search of you!

Writer:
O, sad day in Granada,
to make the stones weep,
seeing Marianita dying on the scaffold
for want of betrayal!

Several decades before the Copernican Revolution, the influence of Platonic intellectuals was a driving force of the creation of the Renaissance replacing the main reference to Aristotle with that of Plato. This change was a key base for both the artistic revolution and the scientific revolution of those times. One of the relevant dimensions of Platonism was the link and equal consideration of beauty, goodness, and truth. Another relevant dimension was the importance given to mathematics. Both dimensions are key points in the scientific revolution developed by Copernicus and other scientists.

Besides poetry and arts in general, science is also a human creation that changes and improves humanity. Its creations are used even by those who criticise or deny this progress, creations such as running water or written language. Millennia ago, philosophy was invented as the source of formalised knowledge and mathematics as the subsequent basis of most sciences. However, it was not until the 16th century that the natural sciences were developed as such, transforming previous knowledge with the publication of the book "De Revolutionibus" in 1543. With this text, which applied mathematical knowledge to the analysis of the solar system, Copernicus triggered the first of the two great scientific revolutions of humankind (the other is the current revolution). In particular, he made it possible for part of astrology to be transformed into astronomy, but he also facilitated the development of physics, chemistry, and other natural sciences.

Until the 16th century, the dominant conception was geocentrism, the idea that the Earth was the centre of the universe and the Sun rotated around the Earth. The calculations based on this assumption did not match the

observations that have been made about the movement of the celestial bodies for centuries. Although the idea that the Sun was in the centre existed many centuries before, Copernicus supported it with more rigorous mathematical calculations. The feudal powers like the Catholic Church imposed geocentrism. Copernicus's contribution was to demonstrate that the mathematical calculations made on the basis that the Sun was in the centre matched empirical observations of the movements of celestial bodies. In order not to have problems with the feudal powers, he added an introduction explaining that he did not say that the reality was that the Sun was in the centre, but only that this idea was useful for predicting the movements in the universe.

Galileo was one of the authors that took this demonstration from Copernicus and affirmed that in reality the Sun was in the centre. There has been a widely disseminated hoax about a supposed fight between religious people against scientists and scientists against religion, taking as the main proof the trial to which Galileo was subjected by the Catholic Church in 1633. However, most of the authors sustaining this hoax ignore that Copernicus was not against religion but was the substitute for a bishop of the Catholic Church. They also ignore the fact that the first attacks to Galileo for maintaining heliocentrism were made by his colleagues at the university; lacking the arguments and evidence to defeat Galileo's conception, they denounced him to the Catholic Church and then the Catholic Church made the aforementioned trial. The fight was not between scientists and religious people, because Copernicus was both at the same time. The fight was between science and a feudal conception of religion that denied and attacked scientific discoveries contradicting their interpretations of the sacred books.

Those debates and the final victory of science opened the great scientific revolution of the modern age. This revolution was not the substitution of theoretical conceptions for empirical data, but the development of new theoretical conceptions able to interpret the empirical data and discover results that widened our knowledge and improved our conditions of life. Before mentioning the scientific revolution of the 21st century, it is important to clarify why Copernicus's heliocentric theory, placing our Sun in the centre, was victorious, and not the one by Bruno, who affirmed that there was not only one sun in the universe, but many suns.

Unfortunately, there are still those who make everything or almost everything depend on power relations in society, reducing scientific development to just one of its consequences. The concept of *paradigm* is the best known in this perspective [85]. It was difficult for heliocentrism to impose itself in a context still dominated by feudal powers. If we draw on Kuhn's paradigm conception, it would have been more difficult, it was still more difficult, in fact impossible, to accept Bruno's affirmation that our sun and our solar system was only one among many. Kuhn's conception of the subordination of science to power is still very much present today in the claims that scientific developments are determined by power groups and their ideologies. This conception dismisses the influence of science in the change of society.

A different perspective about science and how scientific developments take place considers that scientific development is at the same time one of the consequences and also one of the causes of the evolution of societies, and of their power relations. Dialogic theories take into account the influence of social revolutions on science, and the influence of scientific revolutions on society. Their scientific analysis compares the scientific basis of "De Revolutionibus" by Copernicus with "The Ash Wednesday Supper" [86] by Bruno and concludes that Copernicus provided impeccable mathematical arguments and calculations for the time while Bruno had very accurate intuitions centuries ahead of his time, but without arguments and calculations to support them. I had the opportunity to participate in a seminar in which Bruno's book ("The Ash Wednesday Supper" [86]) was discussed for a whole year and I was not able to find those arguments and calculations. This way, Kuhn's analysis reduces the work of scientists to a mere legitimation of social changes. On the contrary, dialogic theories outline the key role played by scientists in social changes, returning to science and scientists their relevance for society and individuals.

We are now in the most profound and accelerated scientific revolution in history. During the COVID-19 pandemic, we have seen and experienced the incredibly quick creation of relevant scientific knowledge and its social impact on the improvement of our lives. The sharing of knowledge among scientists from different specialities and parts of the world has been much

quicker and more transparent than ever before. Although on social networks such as Twitter the hoax about COVID-19 had many more tweets than did the scientific evidence, the tweets with scientific evidence had many more retweets than the ones based on hoaxes [87]. The dissemination and transference of scientific results such as the administration of vaccines have also been much quicker than before.

The horrible inequalities determining that those COVID-19 vaccines did not reach the poorest parts of the world have been publicly criticised more than ever. Moreover, the lack of intelligence of this exclusion also poses a danger for rich people because it increases the possibility of new coronavirus variants. We have also assisted the most open and generalised citizen criticism to the negative consequences of the dominant model of progress and its destruction of nature, to the limitations of the policies that only take into account the human species without taking into account our relationships with animals, and to the same negative consequences of the dominant model of the scientific development.

On the one hand, it is quite sad to see how unknown the name of Karikó is among citizens, in the media and even among scientists from other disciplines. This woman has been one of the main scientists (if not the main) who has saved our lives. On the other hand, this is partially a consequence of a positive dimension of the present scientific revolution. Karikó has worked with many, and very diverse scientists and her objective was not to become famous, but to create scientific knowledge able to overcome some of our health problems. She has had great success.

Poetry, science, and rights. Rosa Parks and Desmond Tutu

The beauty of arts, the truth of science, and the goodness of human rights are the three main treasures created by humanity. Throughout history, many people from all parts of the world and cultures have contributed with their words and their actions to human rights for all, overcoming discriminations and replacing violence by dialogue, by peace. Rights are not separated from beauty and truth; they closely interact with each other.

Without science there are no human rights; the rights to health, to education, and all the others can only be real with the contribution of scientific discoveries. Without human rights, science has strict limitations. The benefits of the discoveries do not reach everybody, they do not reach those excluded from human rights. When science does not consider human rights, it does not receive the support from resources needed for its development. Most scientists have been very supportive of human rights and some of them have even paid for them with their lives.

Mathematician and scientist Condorcet, besides publishing a book in 1790 defending women's rights, was also the author of the report about Public Instruction in France, in 1792. His defence of human rights, including the opposition to death penalty, led him to be condemned to death by the Jacobins; he died in prison. Philosopher and writer Olympe de Gouges, besides publishing a book about women's rights in 1791, was very active against slavery (like Condorcet). She also paid for it with her life in defence of human rights and was condemned to death penalty and guillotined.

The best-known leader of the civil rights movement is still Martin Luther King, and of course, he was very important. Sometimes, Malcom X is also highlighted as the second leader. When a woman is named, it is frequently Angela Davis rather than Rosa Parks, who is sometimes brought up. In reality, Angela Davis was not a leader, neither did she participate in the most important moments of the civil rights struggle. Instead, at that time she was in Germany, very much involved in the movement against the Vietnam war and received the support of the leaders of the so called "socialist republics" of Eastern Europe.

Years before, in 1955, an outstanding working woman, Rosa Parks, made the action that became the symbol of the civil rights movement, although this movement is older, and Rosa Parks joined it in 1950. The invisibilisation of these working-class women in favour of others closer to the political or intellectual elites is not only an ethical problem, but also a scientific problem, because this operation needs to promote falseness or, at least, hide the truth.

The image of a tired working woman getting up from her bus seat being forced to give it up to a white man because of their different skin colour is

ugly. The argument to sustain this ugly obligation is false, science has demonstrated that there is not a human race or ethnicity superior to others. Rosa Parks transformed this ugliness into beauty justifying with dialogue, not with violence, the truth about the quality of human beings from any culture and the reason why she was not going to get up from her seat.

Rosa Parks is one of the many women and men that have been creators of new rights of humanity. As any other human being, her ideas, sentiments, personality were created and developed in dialogue with other persons. At that time, she was a participant in the extraordinary Highlander School, where people like Martin Luther King also participated in their training of developing human rights. She was not isolated in her condition of being a victim of racism and sexism, she was supported by friends and colleagues in her voluntary effort to transform herself into a survivor.

I have always heard people talk about the Highlander School as a symbol of the movements for human rights for many and very diverse countries of the world. Only once did I visit this school, and there I found people from different cultures dialogically learning how to democratically develop the leadership of social movements. This is also what is possible to know reading the book "We make the road by walking" [88], co-authored by the founder of Highlander and Paulo Freire, one of the most important representatives of dialogic education (an approach developed now by professors from Cambridge and other universities). Freire was very motivated to develop not only the scientific and the ethical dimensions of the dialogic perspective, but also the aesthetical one uniting truth, goodness, and beauty. In 1995, Paulo enjoyed very much a conversation we had in Valverde's home and planned some works from this perspective. José María Valverde won the Spanish Poetry Prize at 23 years old and was one of the best professors of Aesthetics. Unfortunately, he died in January 1996, more than one year before Paulo.

There are many brave women, like Rosa Parks, doing excellent actions in favour of human rights. In academia, we have the young women creators of the solidarity network MeToo University. They are improving the goodness of the universities, as well as their beauty. In one of the caravans they made in collaboration with 15 universities, they chose to be accompanied by a video elaborated by them with a song performed also by them (a soprano and

a clarinettist, both with a degree from the Conservatory of Music). Its lyrics are the following [89]:

Brave

They don't just talk, they act
They leave no one isolated
They do not look the other way
They will always be your fairies

Sappho inspires your story
Let no one silence you, talk!
Now you will always be very free
You will no longer be harassed

You will never be a victim again
You will be accompanied
Scheherazade is with you
You can go with Ariane

Desmond Tutu received the Nobel Peace Prize for his coherence in the defence of equal rights for every human being in the critique of the apartheid in South Africa and other countries, doing so peacefully and not supporting violence. If we look at the history of the 20th and the 21st centuries, the advances in human rights have been generated by peaceful movements and dialogic leaders. Sometimes peaceful persons are labelled as innocents who achieve nothing, while supposed radicals who resort to violence are believed to achieve everything.

However, the empirical analysis of reality shows the opposite. The greatest violence that has been supposedly carried out to achieve human rights has had the opposite effect. Western imperialisms that exercised violence in other places to supposedly bring democracy and human rights to them destroyed many lives to enrich themselves. These are supposed revolutions that generated millions of deaths instead of rights, they led to dictatorships as, for example, that of Stalin.

Killing people to take the power and continue killing is not a revolution, it is barbarism. Revolution is the transformation of society in order to get a better

world, which includes the elimination of death penalty. There are people who call mass killings of people a revolution, even if they do not achieve greater freedom or equality. Similarly, there are those who do not consider profound improvements in freedom and equality a revolution if many people have not been killed in achieving them.

Legislation, since the code of Hammurabi, was already a great advance of humankind. From the beginning they replaced the arbitrariness of the law of the strongest as a form of relationship by rules that were increasingly binding on all people. There are ignorant people who identify freedom as the absence of rules and even those who say that it is by destroying the rules that freedom is achieved. On the contrary, it is through rules that people achieve freedom and consolidate it. If the reader of this book can go out on the street tonight without fear of being raped, it is precisely because there is legislation against rape, protective of sexual freedom, and institutional instruments to make it effective. If it did not exist, there would be no freedom because anyone with more strength or more weapons could destroy that freedom with a sexual violation.

The process of drafting and approving legislation is becoming increasingly dialogic and, therefore, more favourable to freedom, equality, non-sexism, non-racism, and other values and human rights. However, although it is varying in its forms, the conflict between civil law, divine law, and natural law, which was already raised in the myth of Antigone, also remains in our society today. Creon applied the civil law when saying that one of Antigone's brothers should not receive funeral honours nor even be buried due to having fought against his homeland Thebes. Antigone, on the contrary, alluded to a divine law placed above the civil law that allowed her to give him burial, which was in fact to avoid his sentence to eternal death. The lack of dialogue generates a tragedy in which not only Antigone herself dies, but also Creon's son and wife do.

Goya, Beethoven, democracy, and rationality

Goya is considered as one of the main initiators of modern painting. Beethoven is clearly the initiator of Romanticism in music. At the beginning,

both were enthusiastic about the French Revolution. However, they were both soon disenchanted. Goya took distance already since Robespierre's regime of terror and the authoritarianism of the Directorate. Beethoven maintained his enthusiasm even for Napoleon, to whom he initially dedicated his third Symphony, named Bonaparte. However, he was very quickly disenchanted when Napoleon was crowned Emperor, erased the name of Bonaparte, and changed the title into Eroica symphony. The anti-authoritarian character of Beethoven's music is present in very relevant historical events, although unfortunately there are few references to that. For instance, the anti-Nazi allies in World War II used the first four notes of the 5th Symphony as a sign of victory that they communicated in morse language, in which they mean V as in "victory". Now, diverse anti-authoritarian citizens make this kind of use, for instance in my research centre this is the way to communicate victories among the members being in different parts of the world.

Goya painted a very suggestive picture with the title "El sueño de la razón produce monstruos" (which means *the sleep of reason produces monsters*). The second of the two available writings, with Goya's own calligraphy, attached on one sketch of the painting in 1797 clarifies that the correct translation of that title is the one we can find at the Prado Museum where the picture is displayed ("The Sleep of Reason produces Monsters"): "The author sleeping. His intent is to shake off harmful grossness and perpetuate with this work of whims the sole testimony of truth. 1797." Looking at the painting and enjoying its beauty, we see that his posture is clearly sleeping, not dreaming, as the painter clearly says in the mentioned writing. One of the dimensions of the beauty of this painting is its meaning. Any adulteration of the painting that would change its drawing or its meaning destroys its beauty, it would not be Goya's artistic work anymore, but a vulgar plagiarism.

In English, German and other languages, there are two different translations for the Spanish word "sueño" with very different meanings (like sleep or dream). Following the Nietzschean attack on reason, democracy and equality, postmodern voices have translated Goya's sentence as "The Dream of the Reason produces Monsters". As Umberto Eco criticised, deconstructionist authors can interpret whatever they want about any text or

painting; to do so, they do not even have to read the text they are interpreting. Therefore, it is not surprising that they do not read the books they talk about. It is surprising, however, that they have never visited the painting they are talking about, or maybe they have visited it but have not read in the museum the correct translation of this sentence.

With their hoax "The Dream of Reason produces Monsters", they state that Goya and his painting attribute the monsters to the dream of reason, in other words, that reason has created the monsters. One of the most famous paintings by Goya, "The Third of May 1808", reflects the barbarism of Napoleon's army against the people they said they were going to liberate. It was not only Goya and Beethoven, but all democrats who were at the beginning enthusiastic with the "liberté, egalité, fraternité" promised by the French Revolution later became radically opposed to the terror and the dictatorship violently imposed by the Napoleon Emperor. Their opposition to these monsters is not against the ideal of democracy and equality, on the contrary, it is against the ones that betrayed those ideals, making them sleep.

Many Spanish democrats hoped that the French Revolution would liberate Spain from the authoritarian monarchy. But Napoleon violently invaded the Peninsula and appointed his brother Joseph Bonaparte as Spanish King. Like Goya and Beethoven, the democrats then created The Cortes de Cadiz not in opposition to the democratic ideals of reason, but against those like Joseph Bonaparte who attacked such democracy. In fact, Las Cortes de Cadiz elaborated and approved the first democratic Constitution of Spain in 1812. Unlike his brother Napoleon, Joseph Bonaparte was able to have a luxurious life, first in the USA and later in Florence.

The lack of rigorous and comprehensive reading by most postmodern and poststructuralist authors makes them destroy the beauty of the best art and the best human relationships. Foucault defended the depenalisation of pederasty and rape [90], but among his hooligans we can see many who are even fighters against pederasty and rape, which clearly demonstrates they do not read the intellectual literature they quote. When they discover this through other people, their typical excuse is that we must differentiate between "the author's works" and "the author's life", which again demonstrates that they have not comprehensively read the main books

published by Foucault. He is very clear, it is impossible to find in Foucault's work sentences against pederasty and rape, and he never authorised any interpretation of his works as being a theoretical base to penalise pederasty and rape; on the contrary, he used his concepts to justify those sexual aggressions.

His useless intent of destroying the beauty of free consensual human sexual relationships is complemented with his useless intent of destroying beauty in his writings about the best art. Just before starting his words about Velázquez's painting "Las Meninas" [91], he tries to convince his already convinced followers that he is going to make the most intelligent and relevant analysis of art and Western culture ever done: "In trying to restore the deepest difference ("dénivellation") of Western culture, it is to our silent and apparently immobile soil that we give its ruptures, its instability, its flaws" (p.16). He knows the conclusion before making the analysis because it is always the same conclusion: anything is power, there are no subjects, human beings, who create social reality, power does [92]. He writes about this painting: "This very subject – which is the same – has been elided. And finally free of this relationship that enchained it, representation can be given as pure representation" (p.31).

The lack of knowledge Foucault had about art in general and Mannerism in particular makes him defend his dogma saying such dumb things as that the painter is not looking at the painting. He makes a similar statement about Cervantes and "The Quixote". Reading what he wrote about "The Quixote", most citizens who have read and commented on it know very clearly that Foucault has not read this book, because the other option would be that he read it, but he is not intelligent enough to understand it. Foucault wrote [93]: "In the second part of the novel (...) Cervantes's text turns back upon itself, thrusts itself back into its own density, and becomes the object of its own narrative" (p. 48) [94]. Any real reader of The Quixote knows that this refolding does not come in the second part of the novel, but at the beginning of the first part, in the 9th chapter. Cervantes wrote there that the fictitious writer of the novel, Cide Hamete Benengeli, was looking for the manuscript about the "real" The Quixote in order to follow the writing of the novel.

It is not difficult to know that Mannerism, an artistic current very common in the time of Cervantes and Velazquez, introduced the author inside their own work, making in this way art about art. This aesthetic resource has created artistic productions with a beauty that Foucault cannot destroy because intelligent art lovers do not care about what he writes. A lack of intelligence is necessary for following Foucault saying that "This very subject…has been elided" and "representation can be given as pure representation". In "Las Meninas" it is not Velazquez who appears there, but his representation painted by himself, who obviously was the subject who painted the picture and, of course, was looking at the picture while he was painting it, and who did not disappear until the day he passed away.

It is very easy to see how the subject, the human being, is the creator of art. Picasso painted "Las Meninas" several times throughout his life. Anyone can see that Picasso's Meninas are very different from Velazquez's ones; they are painted by two different human beings, two different subjects, with distant artistic styles, coming from very diverse interactions along their lives. Unlike Foucault, Picasso could always see that "Las Meninas" had been painted by a subject, who was one of his main idols along with Goya and other painters. The first time he saw the painting he wrote, "I had the opportunity to confront, for the first time, my idols, they were waiting for me at the El Prado Museum. From then, the painting Las Meninas from Velazquez remained fixated in the retina, obsessively" [95]. Another of his interactions about which much has been written is how impressed he was with one of the main female characters when he went to watch the ballet "Las Meninas".

It was Olga Koklova who acted as the Menina Isabel de Velasco and whom he married. There are diverse analyses about the relation between how Isabel de Velasco appears in Picasso's consecutive paintings of the Meninas and the consecutive situation of the relationship between Picasso and Olga. Of course, the human beings that enjoy artistic beauty like "Las Meninas" and "The Quixote" will continue enjoying them and will demonstrate in this way much more sensibility and intelligence than Michel Foucault.

The freedom to choose ugliness

Very diverse authors have differentiated three realms (ethics, truth, and aesthetics). Two of them (ethics and truth) need consensus and the other (aesthetics) does not. For social life, agreements are needed in the realm of ethics about what is good and what society should defend (such as free consent in relationships) and what is bad and what society should reject (such as harassment). Agreements are also needed on what is true and what is false: for example, whether cyanide is or not dangerous for human health. However, in the field of aesthetics, for life in society we do not need to agree on what is beautiful and what is ugly; people can dress as others find ugly and vice versa, without this being a problem to live together in the same city.

This very important clarification does not solve many of the problems that we increasingly have in dialogic societies, in today's societies. The freedom to live in ugliness is neither a right nor freedom when it becomes an imposition of ugliness on people who want to exercise their right and their freedom to live in beauty. How should one act, for example, before those who say they feel like animals and claim their right to be totally naked in the street and to lick other people without their consent? How should one proceed when in a masculinities congress in which hundreds of people participate, there are three people who stand at the door totally naked and tell the press that this is what the congress is about? What attitude should one take when in a demonstration on March 8, attended by many women from popular neighbourhoods, a girl with a megaphone begins to shout "we are all whores, and we can be even more so" making references to the sexual parts of women with words that most of those women present there consider ugly?

Humankind has been solving many of these problems through dialogue. There is almost universal agreement on the beauty of the original painting of Botticelli's Venus. But that universality is not complete; there are supporters of transgression who claim to find pleasure in destroying beauty. In any case, it is clear that this cannot be done with another person's painting or in their home, nor with what belongs to the community, such as everything that has been declared a cultural heritage of humankind.

There are people who only want beautiful relationships that give them pleasure, happiness, and an increase of their attractiveness and health; they are people who do not want ugly relationships, who do not use their bodies as a tablecloth that receives all the dirt. Individuals can do whatever they want with their body, they can use it for ugly relationships even if it deteriorates their attractiveness and health; however, they do not have the right to impose ugliness on other people's bodies. There are people who have ugly relationships who do not mind that those who have had relationships with them talk with vulgar words about their body parts or their sexual practices; however, many of those who have beautiful relationships want to exercise their right not to use vulgar words to talk about their body parts or to disdain their sexual practices.

Beauty, goodness, and truth are constitutive aspirations of humankind. However, not all people have the same idea of beauty, and many do not even seek beauty, but ugliness. Most people accept that works such as Beethoven's Fifth or the Mahabharata are beautiful. However, there are people who are bored by these works and prefer others such as "Perfume. The story of a murderer" [96]. The publicity that presented this book that was later made into a film, which exalts a women's serial killer as the new literature, had to resort to talking about the author as a great specialist in smells who knew how to awaken the beauty of that sense or even as a great writer. Anyone who wants to know the origin and trajectory of this commercial launch will see that neither the former nor the latter are true; nevertheless, these fakes continue to work to present a women's serial murderer as beautiful when, in reality, in addition to being sexist, bad, he is full of ugliness.

Other people are more honest with themselves and do not identify their tastes with beauty; they like smoking but do not think that smoking is good or beautiful, they know that they like flirting with people who despise them but do not think that this is good or beautiful. In some cases, they know that these ugly tastes do not originate in biology but in the socialisation of coercive discourse, for example in the form of advertisements of tobacco or disdainful hookups. In both cases, the market and its publicity have the very active collaboration of the peers with whom they interact. However, other people

wrongly believe that these tastes "come from their insides", or even that they depend on biology.

The uglinessers against freedom to choose beauty

People choosing beauty take care of the material decoration of their homes: if they hang pictures on the main room's wall, they will be nice ones such as "The Starry Night" by Van Gogh, not a urinary. But they still care more about the human decoration of any room. When we are in a space, we have intensive and profound memories of what we lived there before. Consciously or unconsciously, they influence our lives and the relationships there. Some people decorate their homes and other spaces with wonderful relationships full of beautiful emotions, feelings, and sentiments, besides paintings and other material objects. They do not invite those willing to destroy beauty. They do not allow others to use the reproduction of "The Starry Night" on their wall as a tablecloth for a dirty party banquet and they do not allow others to make a disdainful use of their bodies. In that way, the beauty of their homes and themselves is continuously increasing instead of being deteriorated with ugly and bad uses.

This happens not only in homes, but in the diverse scenes where we live ugly or wonderful events, and not only scenes, but also moments, music pieces and many other diverse activities. Decorating our lives with ugly or beautiful memories becomes part of our persons and influences our present and future relationships. As Ramon y Cajal said, we can be in any moment architects of our brain. As socioneuroscience demonstrates, we are able to make a dialogic reconstruction of our memory, and we do not need to be slaves of our ugliest past events if we have had them. We can decorate the rest of our lives with precious moments and relationships. This would provide us not only with more wellbeing but also with better health and attractiveness.

There are many people who only want beautiful relationships that give them pleasure, happiness and a continuous increase of their attractiveness and health. They only desire the persons who like the same relationships, who are not violent, dirty, who get in love with them instead of disdaining them, the ones who, the day after, like them even more, and not the ones that do

not even greet them. The teenagers who choose beauty receive continuous attacks, due to the increasing attractiveness of their lives, by the uglinessers, by those that besides choosing ugliness try to impose it on others. Uglinessers have the active collaboration of a great part of the institutional media and social media frequently promoting the fake that links attractiveness and sexual excitement to violent and dirty persons and activities.

Their obsessive coercion to try to force others to be like them, in addition to being a sexist authoritarian opposition to the value of freedom, is a clear indicator of the dissatisfaction they have with their intimate relationships and with their lives. Those who choose beauty having very satisfying lives do not care about what uglinessers do and say, and they really do not need to do it. If uglinessers disdain them for having "The Starry Night" on their wall instead of a urinary, they do not even respond, they just do not care; if an uglinesser says the urinary of Deschamps is the greatest work of the new art, they will not even answer because they know quotidian objects much more artistic and beautiful. Most lovers of beauty even take distance from any debate in order to avoid conflict and aggressiveness; because uglinessers know they cannot defend ugliness against beauty with arguments, they use verbal violence (and sometimes not only verbal).

The problem of not entering clearly into the debate is that it leaves a wide-open floor for the coercion of uglinessers, for instance with early teenagers. In many schools, those girls and boys choosing beauty suffer bullying in order to pressure them to choose ugliness. Year by year some are yielding, there are more students being submissive and less maintaining their freedom, and the bullying is becoming harder. At the end of high school, many students have substituted poetry by pornography, wonderful by disdainful relationships, precious by ugly music, nice by disgusting language. In most cases, this change is not the consequence of free decisions, but of not resisting the reprisals received by those choosing to be free.

In order to overcome this bullying and this coercion it is indispensable to go ahead with this debate and clearly defend the freedom of those choosing beauty and reject the authoritarianism of those not respecting them. It is also necessary to argue the truth about this mediocre and reactionary offensive.

The increase of this coercion in the last decades comes from the market pressing us to value and desire what gives more economic benefits with less cost, quality, and effort. One of its tricks is to present ugliness as the liberating, the new, the modern, the postmodern, while presenting beauty as the submissive, the traditional, the old. It is necessary to clarify that what is submissive is to do what the market dictates one to do and what is liberating is to freely decide. Some free people who do not accept coercion use sayings like this one: "submission means getting angry if someone who had a beer with you the day before does not greet you and accepting the disdain from the one who had sex with you the night before".

Millions of diverse people overcome submission to the worst commercial products of the market with successful cultural actions like the Dialogic Gatherings of literature, paintings, music, and other arts. They promote the enjoyment and motivation for cultural and artistic beauty beyond any commercial interest. Those actions make it possible for everybody, also for people with no academic studies and poor people and their children, to enjoy these works and develop a great motivation for them. And they do so simply by democratically choosing some of humankind's best creations (such as the ones already mentioned) and engaging in an egalitarian dialogue around their enjoyment. Uglinessers try to destroy this democratic motivation for beauty, for instance criticising that they follow what the authorities consider great culture and art. Simultaneously, they defend what some authorities of art criticism dictate, such as saying a urinary is better art than Botticelli's Venus.

Science, ethics, prominence, and money

Anthony Giddens has been one of the most referenced sociologists in the last decades of the 20th century. He has been one of the best in reading, understanding, and explaining other sociologists' contributions. His books have been among the most used as textbooks for students. Being very young he got excellent academic positions, intellectual prestige, and economic remuneration.

After explaining others' contributions for many years, he elaborated a very interesting Structuration Theory. He was intelligent and humble enough to

say, when he read the book "The Theory of Communicative Action", that "there is no doubt that this book represents a great achievement, and all of us who work in social theory will use it as a resource many years after almost all of the current literature in the social sciences has been forgotten" (p. 192) [97]. Then, Giddens did not continue developing his fruitful Structuration Theory and got interested in the works elaborated by Ulrich Beck; in fact, their three books on modernity from 1990 to 1994 are much more in the line developed by Beck to that moment than what Giddens previously did, and his 1992 book "The transformation of intimacy" [98] was written after reading the Beck-Gernsheim "The normal chaos of Love" [99].

One decade later, Giddens was one of the intellectuals receiving money from dictator Gadafi, presenting him as a great thinker and facilitating an academic degree for his son. The first very negative thing for sociology and society is that a sociologist presented a dictator as being democratic; in scientific terms, this is as if an astronomer said that the Sun revolves around our planet. The second very negative thing is to present a dictator, who has no academic credentials and has not done any intellectual contribution, as a prominent thinker. The third thing is to present as a reference and example a dictator who selected as his personal bodyguard young women who later reported having been raped first by the dictator and then by other leaders of his dictatorship.

Giddens did not do that for ideology, he was a democratic intellectual and one of the first to recognise the great contributions of women to social sciences. What happened during those ten years in which he abandoned scientific rigour and thus the mission of our discipline? Among other things, he started to say that sociologists should write the kind of books that are sold in airport shops. Although his books were in the bookstores of many universities and countries, he wanted to go one step further and be read by more and more diverse people. He did not achieve this goal with sociological books and moved his focus to his implication in practical politics. Giddens became the most well-known intellectual of what was presented as the new social democracy, the "third way", by Blair's government in 1997. His name and his ideas about this "third way" were in the media and read by many people who had not known his name until that moment. I received an email from Giddens saying that he was not a sociologist anymore but an

administrator. Blair's "third way" ended in failure politically and intellectually; it was proven that the third way was not a new contribution but a new publicity strategy for an old idea. At that moment, Giddens started to appear with Gadafi instead of with Blair.

The following words are not about Giddens's case, but about the motivations of human beings for the creation of scientific knowledge. I have known Nobel Prize laureates and other scientists with an outstanding motivation for science. They do not need to sit at the same table with the most powerful politicians or to be in the media (many avoid this as much as they can). What they care about is their creation of knowledge and the social impact their results obtain in improvements of individual human beings and society. They are satisfied and grateful for their middle-class lifestyle, with much less money than others that were much less brilliant when they shared classrooms at schools and universities with them, but with more than most people who are also working many hours in industry or touristic companies.

These kinds of people and motivations are more frequent where the focus is on scientific contributions and their social impact. We cannot find those kinds of people when the focus is on their own fame and retribution. Most people who know they have received health benefits from the new vaccines (messenger RNA) do not even know the name of Karikó. On the contrary, most people who know the word "liquid" linked to the analysis of society know the name of Bauman; however, these people do not know any improvement on individuals or society derived from the use of this word.

When the objective is the creation of knowledge and its social impact, it is worthy to be with politicians, in the media, to recognise the individual names, to give them awards. All this is in the benefit of science and society. But when the objective is the other way around, the victims are science and society. The solution is easy, and it is in our hands. It is enough to ask ourselves about the scientific contributions and social improvements generated by an author before giving her or him recognition. It is important not to make the mistake of identifying an idea or a word that we consider "interesting" as a scientific contribution.

Social artists

None of the 9 muses occupied herself with painting, sculpture, or architecture. These activities were not considered art but rather handicrafts frequently made by slaves. The later classifications of the arts did not include them either. For instance, the most widespread classification of the arts was the one done by Galeno in the 2nd century BC, and he did not include them in the trivium nor in the quadrivium, but in the common arts, as they did not have an intellectual origin. Painters were not considered artists until the Renaissance, when they started to be considered creators of beauty. Even Botticelli had to paint his famous "Nascita di Venere" following step by step the instructions given by intellectual Ficino who, in turn, obeyed the commission received by the Medicis. Later, patronage and collecting facilitated the increase in status.

Since the 19th century, the art market already attributes painters and sculptors a status of artists with an almost superhuman condition, almost divine. In fact, Dali is frequently associated with the name "the Divine". That supernatural character protects them (although less and less so) from any criticism of behaviours contrary to human rights. Even saying that Dali congratulated Franco for what he did, or that Neruda had committed rape (as explained in his memoirs named "I Confess that I Have Lived" [100], on page 44) was considered a lack of respect to those who, as ancient kings and emperors whose power emanated from God, were allowed to do whatever they wanted. For decades, I had many discussions with many intellectuals, some of them feminists, who would get angry when I quoted Neruda's account of the rape, claiming that I was taking it out of context and thus playing into the hands of the right wing. My response was always that, by defending Neruda's rape, they were playing into the hands of the worst form of sexism and that, thanks to the courageous people who spoke the truth, we were moving towards the rejection of any rape, whoever did it and whoever defended it.

The situation is changing and will change even more in the next few years. An increasing number of citizens is rejecting the acceptance of violence against women when the aggressor is a famous artist. They reject actions such as that Neruda raped, that Klimt did not care about transmitting syphilis

to women, or that Pollock hid his wife's artistic career until he died. And this increasing number of citizens also rejects the disdain some artists have towards citizens themselves. Richard Serra had citizens' opposition to his walls both in New York and in Barcelona. The one in New York had a victory and the wall was removed from this place, despite Serra's attitudes. The wall in Barcelona is still there, it is not the art citizens like, they do not even consider it as art. Many of those citizens know that citizens were enthusiastically following the work of Michelangelo creating his beautiful and antiauthoritarian David instead of a wall that generates diverse problems to children and their families. But Serra has clarified his position towards citizens, for instance when he said "Art is not pleasurable. It is not democratic. Art is not for the people." [101]

It is of deep sociological and societal relevance to analyse those kinds of debates. Serra's wall is situated in a working-class area of Barcelona. Five years after the publication of Bourdieu's "The Distinction" [102], some of the administrators making this decision said that workers do not appreciate art. Citizens' answer was more intelligent: "so, you should situate the wall in the upper-class areas where you live". Another argument of the administrators was the very high amount of money some people offer for this art, and citizens' answer was that they value art by its beauty, not by the criteria of the market. Administrators also tried to convince them saying that Serra's art is inspired by his former job as a worker in a factory, and the neighbours answered that they had worked much more than Serra in factories and knew the industrial landscape much better than him. Paraphrasing "L'État c'est moi" by Louis XIV, some artists try to impose the idea "L'art c'est moi" (The art is me).

On the contrary, there are excellent artists with a very different orientation. For instance, Nigerian architect Mariam Kamara. Her team presents her [103]: "Through her practice, Mariam aims to discover innovative ways of doing so, while maintaining an intimate dialog between architecture, people, and context". Kamara [68] believes that "African architects should stop trying to copy what already exists in the West but look to their own history and heritage to produce architecture that is reflective of the region in which the buildings exist (…) We have to understand and respect where people are coming from and why they aspire to the things they aspire to".

The first steps of the overcoming of the invisibilisation of female artists are enriching art. Painter Artemisia Gentileschi created in the 17th century what is probably the best painting of a successful breakout of a woman from a rapist. Her painting "Corisca and the Satyr" combines an incredible beauty with an antisexist goodness. Having been raped years before, she expresses the ugliness of the satyr and the beauty of the woman escaping from him in every detail. Citizenry is recovering in a very dialogic and present form the union between beauty, goodness, and truth that Botticelli so well represented in the aforementioned painting. The rupture of that unity has generated a great loss of meaning and a disenchantment that is now being recovered through a dialogue that creates meaning, a citizen dialogue that already rejects the fact that someone who has had the impunity to rape up to the point of explaining it in his publications is considered the poet of love for a long time.

That creation of meaning on the part of citizens' dialogue is being given not only in the art domain linked to beauty but also in the intellectual domain linked to goodness and beauty. Finally, Althusser (who strangled his wife) is no longer considered someone to be admired, nor is his work to be admired when he himself recognised that he wrote about theories that he had not even read. Citizenship increasingly desires and gives more and more value to the works and the people who are at the same time beautiful, good, and truthful. Obviously, there are also those who are motivated by and/or choose the contrary, that is, what is mean and/or ugly and/or false.

In the Renaissance, patronage raised paintings to the category of art: pictorial art. Now, citizens' dialogue is raising social creations to the category of a new art: social art. This new art, as the "Nascita di Venere", is beautiful, good, and truthful. The creation of new human relationships is not less difficult nor less important for humanity than the creation of new paintings. The creation of human relationships that are free of slavery and racism required social artists like Rosa Parks, who had the inspiration of not giving her seat to a white man in spite of being legally obliged to at that time. Picasso said, "when inspiration comes, let her find me working". Inspiration also found Rosa Parks "working" because by then she was receiving training

in the Highlander school in which Martin Luther King and other leaders of social movements from different parts of the world also received training.

It is true that Rosa Parks did not receive any funding for that, neither from patrons nor from the art market, but an increasing number of citizens reject only valuing what is accompanied by money. It is that part of citizenship that is saying louder and louder that the creation of new human relationships which are freer and more egalitarian are beautiful, good, and truthful. The persons creating them are not pictorial artists but are social artists.

Like painters paint different paintings, there are also social artists that make different social creations. Jane Addams, Nobel Peace Prize laureate, in addition to being one of the founders of sociology and of feminist sociology, co-founded the Hull House settlement house. The Hull house had a very prominent role in the inclusion of migrants, in the promotion of female labour and female suffrage and in other social reforms. Inspired by her, other people also created similar houses, up to five hundred. In fact, social art is more related with the nine muses than pictorial art, because one of the tasks of the muse Clio is to maintain the generous actions of humans alive, and the social creations made by Jane Addams are very generous actions.

This is one of the characteristics of social art. In principle, if someone paints the Meninas, neither the work will be considered artistic (but a copy or plagiarism) nor the person who makes it will be considered an artist. However, Picasso did so and his paintings of the Meninas are considered artistic works. On a similar vein, in social art, the re-creation of a work in a new context is considered social art and those who make it are also considered social artists. Each new settlement of Hull House that was funded in a new context was a new social creation, it was social art.

This characteristic is what some say makes it impossible for it to be considered social art. This is the way of thinking of people who do not value a work for its artistic value but for the money that is paid for it or by the elite in which it places one above the rest of the people. However, an increasingly greater part of citizenry does not submit to the market nor to the power in appreciating the artistic value of a pictorial creation or a social creation. And

works are valued increasingly for the art they contribute and not for the search for money or power above other people.

IV. THE SOCIOLOGY CITIZENS LIKE AND USE

Citizens claim for science full of goodness, truth, and beauty

During the first economic and social crisis of the 21st century, citizens have reacted against bureaucratic science. This criticism arrived, for instance, in the context of the elaboration of the European scientific programme of research. Citizens claimed they did not know the usefulness of, first, the specific budget for social sciences, and later, of the whole scientific program. Max Weber analysed the tendency to bureaucratisation of capitalist companies and the modern state. Sociology and other sciences have also experienced a process of bureaucratisation, moving them away from their original democratic objectives and meaning. Universities and scientists have developed their own dynamics, which sometimes are more oriented to their particular interests than to being a service to citizens.

In one European Conference with the title "Science against poverty" a complaint and a demand were raised. The complaint was that most researchers only presented diagnoses about poverty, but not scientific evidence of the actions that have success overcoming poverty. The demand was exemplified by saying that "investing 3 million euros for research on poverty is only justified if researchers can present evidence that, with their studies, poverty will decrease more than if the 3 million euros are given to the poor themselves".

The survival of the social sciences was achieved *in extremis* by the commitment to a profound and rapid change towards social sciences with a much higher scientific level, rigour, social impact, and continuous dialogue with citizens. This transformation is happening so profoundly that it has led to the most flourishing period in the history of sciences such as sociology, which has rightly come to the rescue of other sciences. The questioning of the social sciences was soon transferred, albeit in a different way, to all the

sciences. Ministries of health of national and international governments began to say that what the scientific programs (and, in their case, the ministries of science) were doing was of no use to them in improving health care for the public. With this argumentation, they began to demand that the budget available for health research in these scientific programs be transferred to their ministries, as they would know better how to carry out the studies that would improve people's health.

The solution was again the dialogue demanded by society and representatives from the different sciences, in this case already led by sociology. Social impact and co-creation became requirements for scientific research in all fields. Social impact is linked to the improvement of citizens' living conditions. This does not mean that the only valid science is the one that can have a quick practical implementation. Of course, what was called basic or fundamental research is needed. Scientists have been able to quickly obtain vaccines against COVID-19 thanks to the basic research made during decades without any practical implementation. Social impact actually means that the objective of all kinds of research, basic or applied, is the improvement of citizens' lives.

What is and what is not an improvement in citizens' lives? Who decides this? The answer here is very clear: citizens and their democratically elected representatives. Scientists cannot decide the objectives of society, this would be antidemocratic. They should be social servants of people, providing them with scientific knowledge that enables them to make clear steps towards their own objectives. Currently, these objectives are the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). With all the limitations and imperfections that have already been indicated in this book, the SDGs are much more democratic than any other existing list.

The other criteria, co-creation, means that scientists should create knowledge in close collaboration and continuous egalitarian dialogue with citizens. An increasing number of people want to be informed about the results of scientific research and their voices to be heard from the beginning until the end of the study, as well as to participate in the evaluation of the social impact of these studies.

As a result of this process, diverse natural and human sciences are today requesting sociology to help them assess the social impact of their research, optimise it, and build their knowledge in continuous dialogue with citizenry. Suddenly, people in biology, engineering, medical sciences, etc., have begun to ask social scientists for collaboration and to value the knowledge social sciences bring to the table. Of course, they are not requesting this from all kinds of sociologists, but only from the ones who are prepared to do this task, from those who are developing a dialogic sociology, a sociology based on the dialogue with the diversity of voices, including scientists from other fields.

Whenever I have talked with outstanding sociologists about this, I have always received very positive answers. I will just provide two examples of their written words. Ulrich Beck wrote the following for one of my books: "Therefore, this is a dialogical book in many ways that draws the readers out of their passivity and invites them to actively collaborate and respond (…) without theoretical knowledge, practical problems are more difficult if not impossible to solve. This is the conviction the book reveals (...). It combines rigorous research with facts, including the intention for a dialogical utopia (…) But this broad intention is presented in the book, joining theory with critique and empirical research with praxis, in such a charming way that it grabs its readers and captures them under its spell…". Alain Touraine wrote about another of my books: "Sometimes, as Flecha here demonstrates, knowledge flows from the bottom up, when individuals with no degree or academic background 'produce' and 'invent' cultural analyses on the basis of their own experience, their thoughts, and the exchange with creators of their own culture."

Admittedly, this process caught many researchers in the field unaware, especially those whose knowledge and conception of sociology had little or nothing to contribute to society and to science. Some were so focused on promoting their own curriculum vitae that, when they managed to publish an article, they no longer cared whether or not that content had improved anyone's life. Others were caught up in the magic of book titles. It is significant that the most cited sociologist at the time was an author who was a military agent of Stalinist repression from 1945 to 1953 and used to write orthodox Stalinist works. Suddenly, he switched to publishing books in

which one recurring word was constantly repeated: "liquid". Hopefully, there was no sociologist so clumsy as to make a fool of themselves when asked for collaboration from researchers in physics or neuroscience by saying as an ultimate contribution that we are in a liquid society and citing Bauman as the key author.

There were also sociologists who did studies for the governments of their own ideology. These sociologists are very concerned about the results of elections because the evaluation of their work will depend on whether their party or the other party ends up governing. A medical researcher knows that the electoral result will determine the amount of funding for health and whether it is more public or private, but they cannot conceive that treatments for heart attacks could be different depending on whether left- or right-wing parties govern. When they see that such understanding is not the same for sociologists, they think that ours is not a science, but rather pure ideology disguised as science. Unfortunately, they are right in the case of some sociologists.

Violence, poverty, early school leaving, homelessness, political persecution, and other cruelties spread ugliness around our world. The SDGs, oriented to overcome these problems, introduce a horizon of social beauty. In doing so, beauty is not only in some spaces, moments, or individual persons, it is not only in museums or in starry nights, but in all villages, streets, homes and in all persons.

Social Media Analytics

Citizens, policy makers and scientists committed to lead the overcoming of the crisis of scientific research programmes have provided a participative, free, and cheap methodology. The surveys and other consultations made until this moment were very expensive and reached only a few and homogeneous people. Almost all responders of public consultations about the research programmes were the individuals and groups who wanted to apply for resources of those programmes. Most citizens did not even know and were not interested at all in those consultations.

The following process came as the main result of the creation of the dialogic methodology of Social Media Analytics (SMA) [104]. An increasing number and diversity of citizens (more than half of the world population) are continuously using social media. More than 99% of them have never been motivated to participate in any consultation about research programmes or about the priorities of any natural or social sciences, but many of them include in their messages content about the relevance and the social impact of the implementations of the research results.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, SMA has clarified that most citizens who do not participate in those consultations include in their messages content related with the relevance and social impact of science, as is the case of their reactions to vaccines and their opinions about the pandemic and the actions to overcome it. As previously mentioned in this book, SMA has also clarified that Twitter has had more hoaxes and less scientific evidence than the Chinese Weibo [105].

The finding of SMA clarifying that in social media like Twitter there have been more tweets with hoaxes than with scientific evidence about the COVID-19 but more retweets of the tweets with scientific evidence than of the ones with hoaxes [87] has been especially important. This has led to identifying activists for scientific evidence in social media. The following step of SMA has been to complement their analyses with very successful SMA actions; SMA has demonstrated that providing activists with scientific evidence (with their references in publications and research projects) greatly increases the impact of their inclusive communication of science on citizens.

These Successful Actions of SMA (SSMAA) are being replicated in relation to other SDGs, generating an outstanding co-creative social impact. When a Ministry of a Government demanded social scientists to analyse the discourses of racism, xenophobia and hate speech, among other contributions, they decided to develop SSMAA providing scientific evidence to the activists in social networks. These actions increased the number and diversity of activists and the impact they had on other users of those social networks. Other SSMAA are being created and implemented in other fields, such as the overcoming of hoaxes about gender and about education [106,107].

The scientific development of SMA is parallel to the development of the ethical criteria to conduct such methodology and to the proposals of new legislations to guarantee the rights of users of social media. The main criterion is that the users are the owners of their own voices, and they are the ones that have to decide all kinds of uses of those voices.

One of the areas of social impact of some international scientific programmes is citizen participation. In the short term, it means the participation of some citizens from the beginning in the elaboration of the research project. In the medium term, it is necessary that citizens' engagement goes beyond the project's lifespan. In the long term, the requirement is citizens' use of the results of the project. There are already five billion citizens using social networks. We can offer them our theories and scientific evidence freely and using them they can improve their lives. Moreover, they can contribute to the creation and improvement of those theories and evidence with their voices and their experiences. SMA has been created to do this task properly and SSMAA has been developed to enhance the inclusive communication of science and the social impact that contributes to making a better world.

SMA is a methodology for all kinds of social activities. A subset is the Social Impact of Social Media (SISM) oriented to analysing the evidence of social impact (for instance, the social impact of research) in social media. SISM finds evidence of social impact unknown by the teams who made the research. Most messages containing that evidence do not mention the name of the project nor the name of the researchers, as frequently social media users do not know them. What they talk about is precisely the experience they have of the use of the research results and their opinions about them. In order to find this, the algorithms should include the words related to the language citizens use in the fields where research results are implemented.

For many decades, the curriculum vitae researchers have presented in the applications to funding calls have been focused on their scientific impact, their scientific publications. Now, there is also the requirement to present their policy and social impact, and this is a new perspective that needs new methodologies. In the first interview, the main researcher of one of the

European projects of research that had more social impact and was outlined as a successful one answered it had not achieved any social impact. SMA was not only a happy discovery of what he considered an incredible methodology but also a profound satisfaction getting to know details of how his research was improving the lives of citizens.

Social media provides very diverse quantitative and qualitative evidence of the social impact of research, but also of any institutional or social actions. In the beginning, there are some misunderstandings about how to implement this methodology. Some researchers are overwhelmed believing they should be as active in social media as their children and grandchildren. It could be convenient, but not necessary; what is needed is to conduct SMA, and this can be done by other members of the team who like social media or by external collaborators. This is not the time of supermen and superwomen knowing and doing everything, this is the time of dialogic and interdisciplinary teams doing more excellent and useful science than ever in the past.

Jane Addams, Nobel Peace Prize laureate, Founder of sociology

For over more than a century, it has been mandatory to consider only men as the main founders and constructors of sociology. To mention women's contribution at the same level as the "fathers" of sociology was considered non-academic and non-sociological. In the last years, some sociologists (women and men) have decided to challenge this censorship and to talk and write directly about the contributions to sociology by human beings, without discrimination to women.

Jane Addams is still not recognised by most professors as the founder of sociology, but she is recognised as the founder of social work. This has been used by some male sociologists as a clear argument for making Addams invisible in sociology. Some sociologists in academia have been very proud to get higher positions in universities than professors in social work and have reinforced this superiority considering that they do the theory and social workers do the practice. They have built a wall: if you are a social worker, you cannot be a sociologist, if you have links with practice, you are not an

academic. Jane Addams was much more farsighted, she continuously crossed this wall and was at the same time a sociologist, a social worker, and a feminist. Interdisciplinarity and links between theory and practice are today requirements for all sciences (including sociology); in that orientation, Addams is an excellent pioneer and person.

One of his friends and collaborators, George Herbert Mead, was also very active in promoting practical social transformations with her, which was one of the reasons why he was made invisible in some circles. Even being a man, he has also been marginalised in sociology, although not so much as Jane Addams. The creator of what is named symbolic interactionism is not talked about in most courses of sociological theory. Even many explanations of symbolic interactionism did not include his name and the reading of his main book "Mind, Self and Society" [54]. In Giddens's book "Modernity and Self-Identity" [108], the concept of self plays an important role, but it does not include a clear explanation of Mead's contribution to this concept. It is significant that the Spanish translation is "Modernidad e identidad del Yo". In the content of the book two very different concepts in English ("Self" and "I") are translated by the same Spanish word "yo", which makes a good explanation of those concepts of Mead impossible. In "Choses Dites" [109], when Bourdieu took distance from structuralism, he quotes Mead as a reference, but there is no explanation whatsoever of his theory, and the little he talks about it does not demonstrate that he even had read any book by Mead.

Jane Addams refused to become a sociology professor, but not a sociologist. In addition to being the co-founder of sociology, she was also the co-founder of social work together with her contemporary Mary Richmond. A bias to make Jane Addams invisible in the history of sociology and theoretical and practical contributions to sociology is that she was not and she did not want to be a university professor. However, the same (random) criteria to adjudicate the label of "sociologist" is not applied to men like Marx who, since Parsons, appears even in textbooks as one of the main authors of classical sociology. In reality, he was not a university professor, and he did not consider himself a sociologist.

Any analysis of Jane Addams's contributions to social theory makes it clear that these followed the same orientation of the current scientific programmes of research and of the best current sociologies and the ones that have more future. Three years before the Department of Sociology in Chicago was founded, Addams had already co-founded Hull House [110]. She defined the activities there with "three R": Research, Residence, Reform. The social impact of her project was much bigger than the social impact of Durkheim and Weber together. Indeed, acting following her concern for the social problems of the industrial society, Jane Addams's work in the Hull House directly improved for decades the impoverished daily life conditions of many children, women, and men of the working class and of immigrant communities. In this way, she consolidated one of the main trends of social work. Additionally, with her action she supported trade unions and contributed to women's suffrage. She also wrote taking a stance against human trafficking and against African American lynching, supporting the anti-lynching activism and the work of Ida B. Wells.

The social impact of the Hull House was larger and was transferred beyond its neighbourhood and beyond the city of Chicago or even the United States. Her conceptualisation and implementation of a social settlement inspired many others around the world. In the first decades of the 20th century there were hundreds of these social settlements in the United States and many others in countries such as Egypt, India, Japan, or Venezuela. For many years, she was involved in participating and leading transnational organisations such as the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, taking a stance for peace before and during the 1st World War, and working together with women from different classes, cultural origins, and nations. This positioning implied her criticisms and reprisals by some sectors of society.

The same happened with her policy impact: the reforms made by the New Deal had a clear base on the reforms proposed by Jane Addams, a friend of Roosevelt's and deeply admired by Frances Perkins (the first woman to ever serve in a presidential cabinet as the 4th US secretary of labour under Roosevelt's mandate) [111]. Jane Addams's work was also key in the way towards promoting legislation to eradicate child labour. The research she promoted was made with an interdisciplinary team and continuous dialogue

with the plurality of voices that are now a requirement in the form of co-creation. She has been the only sociologist and the only social worker being awarded with a Nobel Prize (Peace), and she has made great contributions to society and to sociology.

If sociology is only the struggle to gain positions in universities, Jane Addams is not a sociologist, and those who are only motivated for getting those positions criticise the fact of considering these sociologist women as equal or even more important than the ones considered "the fathers". But that is not sociology. Sociology is the scientific analysis of society that citizens and organisations need in order to democratically advance steps towards their own objectives. In sociology, it is uncommon to find any person who has made more and better contributions than this woman sociologist.

Students and young researchers of sociology learn the sociology citizens like and use more and deeper if their professors dare to challenge the censorship that does not allow them to explain her contributions like "Twenty Years at Hull House". Her theory of democracy criticises its reductionism to a representative democracy in which the elites decide what people need. Democracy needs all persons to be able to be active agents: to think, plan, and participate. One of the four areas of social impact of the European scientific programme of research in all sciences is on citizens' participation as a specification of the co-creation criteria. This is clearly linked to what Jane Addams theorised and did, while some of the authors who have been more referenced in sociology in the past decades said the opposite: that distance is necessary in order to get the objectivity sociology needs because common people only have common sense and are not able to have scientific knowledge about themselves.

Her analysis of inequality explains that it is a social injustice that can be overcome with the best education, including the best cultural creations of humanity. She did this in the adult education she developed at Hull House, for instance, for female workers in dialogue with other women already studying at the university. A sociologist so different to her as Parsons was also brave enough to give a clear importance to the educational revolution. Many professors and authors of social sciences reject teaching subjects related to education, but when they do research on housing, health, gender,

and other social issues, they conclude that the key basis to resolve those problems is education. Some of them reject teaching on education due to one reason studied by sociology: status. Those needing more status than contributions to science and society take this position.

The first time Marta Soler and I met Michael Burawoy, we became impressed by him for different intellectual and personal reasons. One of the intellectual reasons was using our friend Paulo Freire as a reference in his speech at the First International Forum of Sociology. One of the personal reasons was his friendship with Erik Olin Wright. The evening Michael was elected President of the International Sociological Association he invited Erik, Marta, Teresa and myself to dinner. Erik also valued the transformations on education; he wrote [33]: "In Barcelona, Spain, some public elementary schools have been turned into what are called "Learning Communities" in which the governance of the school is substantially shifted to parents, teachers and members of the community, and the function of the school shifts from narrowly teaching children to providing a broader range of learning activities for the community as a whole" (p. 91). In his first speech to the Catalan Association of Sociology, Erik publicly expressed his surprise because some Catalan sociologists had not referenced those learning communities. Harvard Educational Review published an article about the first of those with the title: "La Verneda-Sant Marti: a school where people dare to dream". Years before, Castells expressed publicly his admiration to Freire and decided to co-author a book with other authors [112].

In 2010, Burawoy wrote a clear support to those research centres creating public sociology, which in my view is very much related to what Jane Addams did: "Across the globe there are many institutes, embedded in local communities and with long traditions of practising public sociology, such as SWOP (Society, Work, and Development Institute, University of Witwatersrand, South Africa), CREA (Centre de Recerca Social i Educativa, University of Barcelona), and CENEDIC (Center for the Study of Citizenship Rights, University of Sao Paulo). These institutes all manage to embed their public engagement in serious research programs, subjecting sociology to continual critique and often undertaking principled interventions in the policy field" [113]. Later he edited a special issue of *Current Sociology* in the same orientation [114].

Jane Addams's theorisation and implementation of democracy in the Hull House favoured the creation of egalitarian relationships in a daily basis among women from different social and educational backgrounds, making interclass relationships among women (and also with men) based on friendship and solidarity possible, with a deep impact in the transformation of inequalities in society. This is very different from the reproduction theory that was influential in the sociology of the end of the 20th century, which actually stated the opposite: that schools can only reproduce inequalities and do not contribute to overcoming them. Instead, Jane Addams was much more intelligent and knew that the best way to promote social transformations was to start by one particular centre that provided successful education for all.

Jane Addams's contributions are much more recognised and referenced in gender studies and social work than in sociology, which is very bad for sociology. Without any doubt, she is the creator of feminist sociology, the sociology that does not make the gender dimension invisible. Jane Addams made those contributions in continuous dialogue with popular women, as dialogic feminism [3], which does not make the voices of any woman, including those of the majority of women who do not have a higher education degree, invisible.

Durkheim, Weber, and War

The best intellectuals shine more in the most difficult moments. At the beginning of the First World War, Addams was elected Chair of the Woman's Peace Party of the International Congress of Women and of the commission to find an end to the war. Durkheim and Weber reacted as a French and a German patriot without making any joint effort or analysis for peace. Instead, Durkheim promoted a group of communication in order to publish patriotic articles and pamphlets blaming Germany for the war and even blaming German mentality and intellectuals. Weber received the beginning of the war with enthusiasm, showing it even after its end. Roland Stromberg [115] said that Weber claimed, "the war was a good war" and "History which has given to us and only to us a second springtime, will give

us a third. Of that, I have no doubt". Other famous classical sociologists like Simmel were not in a peaceful position either.

Citizens can understand these reactions not only because they belonged to two different countries, but mainly because of their personal situations. Durkheim's son himself fought and died in the war, along with many of his students. What citizens cannot understand as science is a field in which the representatives replace the truth with their respective ideologies, interests, or individual situations. Some authors outline the publications of those "fathers" of sociology in favour of solidarity and peace. However, they omit the fact that the Great War showed that neither politicians nor the public, nor even those "fathers" themselves, considered their reflections and publications useful at the very moment in which they were most needed. For example, Durkheim's earlier pacifism was linked to the fact that he considered that the evolution of society substituted violence for peace. However, the outbreak of the Great War proved the incorrectness of this analysis that even he himself did not use [116].

Without any doubt, Jane Addams was one of the first and main founders of sociology. She collaborated with George Herbert Mead in the founding of the Department of Sociology at the University of Chicago in 1892. It is usually said that it was Émile Durkheim who held the first Chair of Sociology in 1906; his Chair was actually in Pedagogy and, moreover, Manuel Sales i Ferré already held a Chair of Sociology in 1898. Max Weber was an economics professor, and he was the director of the Institute of Sociology in Munich in 1919. The imposition of the consideration of Durkheim and Weber as the fathers of sociology has necessarily implied making important historical mistakes and invisibilisations. Without any doubt, Jane Addams's stance in relation to war and peace (and also other social problems) was much more sociological, intelligent, and ethical than that of the famous fathers of sociology.

Sociology and sociologists have improved a great deal in the last hundred years. All of us know now that the proofs presented in order to justify the invasion and war of Iraq in 2003 were fakes. What was significant of the change was the position of the American Sociological Association (ASA) calling for an immediate end to the war. This decision was made when the

two political parties of the association's country supported the war; members of ASA had very different analyses and very different attitudes than the patriotism of Durkheim and Weber. The process for arriving at this decision included intensive sociological debates and, finally, the decision's approval was made by two thirds of the members voting in favour and 22% abstaining. Iraq's current situation and the public clarification that the proofs were hoaxes demonstrated the usefulness of this sociology in the difficult situation that led the association to take this position, improving the social reputation of this sociology.

This was not the position of sociology in some countries. The ones who had the control of Spanish sociology at that time were in favour of the war. The quality of their publications made it impossible to get the recognition of the international community, but they had the control of the Spanish departments of sociology, which meant jobs and promotions of scholars. They also had the control of the FES (Spanish Federation of Sociology) and censured any kind of debate like the one of the ASA. Most of the scholars who were already publishing internationally, from very different ideologies, were against the war due to sociological reasons. In the 2004 Spanish Congress of Sociology, there was one symposium titled "Sociology in the face of new risk scenarios". As one of the speakers, I had the opportunity to explain the positions of Durkheim and Weber about the war and the recent process of the ASA as an example of the advancement of sociology in decades. I also explained it as an example of the lack of need to subordinate sociological analysis to the patriotic, colonialist, and non-peaceful positions of the "fathers". Not a single feudal lord of Spanish sociology dared to present any argument, but the FES continued censoring the debate.

A few years later, a new legislation initiated the change of Spanish universities from the feudal structure to a meritocratic and social one, and the scholars are now liberated and can be hired and promoted without any subjugation. The Catalan Association of Sociology (ACS) has published a history book [117] clarifying the Francoist origin and dynamics of this feudal lobby. This lobby is now losing its power in Spanish sociology, although not in the FES yet. This is due to the fact that the president is not chosen among different candidates which publicly expose their programmes. In fact, most members do not even know who the unique candidate will be. The good news

is that the scientific, democratic, and non-sexist change made in the Catalan Association of Sociology and other associations is promoting changes in the FES.

Sociologists have made a key contribution to science and society with a critical analysis of meritocracy. Unfortunately, some professors confuse the rejection of meritocracy with the disdain for merits. They omit three realities. First, when they grade their students, they take into account their merits. Second, when they or their family members have a serious health problem, they want to have doctors or surgeons who have a degree in medicine taking into account their merits. Third, the evaluation by merits partially overcomes the sexual harassment and mediocrity of the feudal evaluations. The sociological critique to meritocracy is very useful for the introduction of social criteria which complements taking into account merits, while the feudal critique to meritocracy is ruled by harassers and mediocre professors.

Scholars intelligent enough to pass evaluations and get the recognition of the international scientific community do not need to subjugate themselves to academic or political hierarchies in order to have a job. They have the freedom needed to elaborate intelligent contributions to science and society. They are able to defend human rights, the SDGs and other objectives democratically decided by citizens. One of those objectives is peace against any kind of violence, and in this issue the best sociologists do not follow the contributions and attitudes of the "fathers".

Classical, contemporary, and democratic sociology

Any glance to the objectives of humanity like the SDGs, even the most superficial one, discovers their clear sociological dimensions. Sociology is the science that is most focused on objectives such as no poverty, zero hunger, good health and wellbeing, quality education, or gender equality. Economics made a great contribution to the analysis and progress of humanity, and it is a very important and necessary science, but sociology has made, in collaboration with other disciplines, the analysis needed for orienting this progress to the objectives of humanity. This is the main legacy of sociology made for two centuries.

It is quite common to classify sociology as classical or contemporary. Frequently, classical sociology includes the authors and contributions made until the publication of the book considered as most important, "Economy and Society" [6], in 1922. The contemporary one usually includes the authors and contributions made since then until the scientific revolution of the 21st century. Most authors and teachers consider the elaboration of the basis of this discipline as classical sociology, which usually coincides with the introduction of sociology degrees in universities and with the reinforcement of the profession in society.

In the 1998 Montreal World Congress of Sociology, a survey was made asking participants to say which had been the most significant book in their training as social scholars [118]. The authors of the first 20 books selected are: Max Weber, Charles Wright Mills, Robert K. Merton, Peter L. Berger, Thomas Luckmann, Pierre Bourdieu, Norbert Elias, Jürgen Habermas, Talcott Parsons, Erving Goffman, George H. Mead, Emile Durkheim, Anthony Giddens, Immanuel Wallerstein, Michel Foucault, Thomas Kuhn, Georg Simmel, and Ulrich Beck. All of them are male, white, and from North America or a few European countries such as France, Germany, Austria, and the United Kingdom.

There have always been excellent female sociologists whose contributions have not been taken into consideration by sociology and have even not been translated. In the same way, there have always been excellent sociological contributions overlooked by sociology in other countries and cultures from all parts of the world as well. This is a clear case of how dominant meritocratic dynamics not only consolidate inequalities and discriminate against individuals and human groups, but also make important merits invisible and waste them.

Recently, there is a process of enrichment of sociology recovering excellent elaborations previously made invisible due to discriminations by gender, race, and other situations. International organisations of sociology are doing a relevant work in partially overcoming those discriminations, outlining contributions and publications from different genders, cultures, and countries. Among the women, there are Harriet Martineau, Marianne Weber,

Jane Addams, and several other sociologists that were at the Hull House. If we take a look again to the aforementioned main legacy of sociology, it is very clear that those objectives are much more clearly linked to the works of those female founders of sociology than to the ones of the "fathers". Any reader of this book can check whether the former focused more on gender, inequalities, education, poverty, and so on than the latter.

In the classical sociology of the 19th century, there were important contributions by women and men. Harriet Martineau, Auguste Comte, and others gave a scientific basis to sociology. During the scientific revolution initiated in the Renaissance, mathematics was taken as a basis for new sciences like astronomy and physics; the new disciplines felt weak and tried to reinforce themselves with a consolidated knowledge for many centuries, as was mathematics. Sociologists of the 19th century tried to base sociology on other consolidated sciences such as physics (Comte [119]) or biology (Spencer [120]).

At the beginning of the 20th century sociology created its basis as a social science incorporating contributions from natural sciences but focusing on human and social actions and structures, which are different from the ones of other animals and even more different than the natural objects. Max Weber is still considered the main author for this task with his already mentioned concept of social action, understood as the one in which participants share its meaning. In addition to contributing to consolidating the interpretation and the comprehension of quantitative studies, this perspective opened the floor for the development of qualitative studies.

Durkheim is considered the second father of classical sociology with contributions like "The Rules of Sociological Method" [121]. His analysis about the move from mechanic to organic solidarity was first focused on the division of labour [122], but his perspective changed to human communication in "The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life" [123] and in the preface to "The Division of Labour in Society" [122]. We have no proof that this new perspective could be inspired by the works by Sales i Ferré [124], but we know that Sales i Ferré and other authors had a similar view some years before.

The most cited book in sociology, "Economy and Society", was published when Max Weber died; it was Marianne Weber who worked on it preparing its publication and finally published it. Marianne Weber, Jane Addams, and other sociologist women published works about the social discriminations by gender and race, and their contributions were not taken into account by those "fathers" of sociology. Even Marianne Weber disagreed with Max Weber's conception of neutrality because he did not take into account the gender dimension. Any current reflection about the history of sociology clarifies that current sociology (the academic and the professional one) is more linked to those analyses made by women who have taken into account gender and race discriminations than to the works of the "fathers".

The contemporary sociologies have been elaborated under the social disruptions related to Nazism, Stalinism, colonialism, civil rights, and feminist and gender movements. Parsons dedicated all his life to try to consolidate democracies against the risks of Nazi or Stalinist dictatorships. Stalinists and its followers have been promoting not to read Parsons's books "because he was a rightist". In fact, what Parsons wanted was to collaborate in consolidating the current democracies. Some people say he was against any social movement, but this can only be said by those who have not read his publications edited by himself, such as "The negro American" [125], which includes precursor studies of the influence of the civil rights movement for society.

The main contribution of his last books was the concept of societal community, which includes four revolutions (industrial, democratic, educative, and expressive). What is very clarifying about many of those "critical intellectuals" disqualifying him as being rightist is that they simultaneously quote and admire the main Nazi intellectual (Heidegger) or his followers (Foucault, Derrida, Arendt). Robert Merton created the sociology of science, possibly the most influential sociological contribution to all sciences; among other consequences, the current scientific rankings are mostly based on those contributions, and Kuhn was inspired by his relationship with Merton.

In order to know how citizens make their decisions to vote in the elections or how they choose their friends or lovers or any other person in their lives,

we need to know how they are influenced by structures and how they make their own decisions in interactions with other persons. Parsons [126], Luhmann [127], Bourdieu [102] and others have made elaborations about the role of structures and systems. Schütz [25], Berger [128], Luckmann [128], Goffman [129], Mead [54] and others have contributed mainly to clarifying the role of subjects and human interaction. Elias [130], Giddens [108], Elster [81], Beck [131], Habermas [132] and others have developed theories of society including the role of subjects and structures.

After classical and contemporary sociologies, within the current 21st century's scientific revolution, we assist an accelerated elaboration of democratic sociologies coming from diverse countries, cultures, genders, ideologies, and perspectives. There are individual names like the public sociology of Michael Burawoy, the multicultural feminism of Fatema Mernissi [133], the real utopias of Erik O. Wright or the social impact of Marta Soler [134], but mostly they are elaborated by groups and networks of diverse people and also in collaboration with other social and natural sciences. Michael Burawoy has been one of the promoters of this democratic sociology not only with his proposal of public sociology, but also with his clarifying focus on centres, networks, and groups of sociologists [135]. This book focuses on dialogic sociology as a contribution to democratic sociology.

Successful actions: the purpose of sciences

The statistical data available on COVID-19 vaccines has been expanded, allowing for the most rigorous analysis of the isolation of variables. However, vaccines were not created from these large statistics, but rather based on the conscientious work of laboratories in constant dialogue through their scientific publications, meetings, and discussions. Then, and only then, did they move on to clinical trials with samples. Once proven effective and with relatively small side effects, vaccines have been administered to very large sectors of the population. Only after this process can we have statistics of the results obtained.

The lack of mastery and understanding of statistics in many prominent social science authors leads them to want to draw causal relationships from them. Moreover, there is a habit of attributing causes to variables like socioeconomic status, which leads to absurd and very negative conclusions. The confusion between correlation and causal relation between school failure and socioeconomic status leads some authors to deny poor children the option to educational success. The lack of intelligence of many intellectuals leads them to identify this reactionary denial of poor students' right to educational success as if it were a revolutionary position. They accompany those hoaxes with statements such as "instead of giving false hope in education, what needs to be done to eliminate inequalities is to end capitalism".

If we read the statistics available today considering only the objective variables, we "clearly" see that there are more COVID-19 deaths among the world's poor population than among the rich. If we do not know statistics, we can infer that the cause of higher COVID mortality is belonging to a lower social class. However, if we introduce other variables such as the health actions carried out, we see that this inequality is largely (but not entirely) overcome when the entire population is equally vaccinated and there is universal quality health care.

Bourdieu became a very famous sociologist with his co-authored book "The reproduction" written in 1970 [136]. What people took from it is that schools reproduce inequalities and cannot overcome them, interpreting statistics through the elementary confusion between correlation and causality. Bright young sociologists have outlined that successful educational actions make schools contribute to overcoming inequalities. This demonstrates that Bourdieu's statement is a hoax that has not contributed to the improvement of results in any school in the world; on the contrary, it has contributed to worsening them. After the publication of this clarification, Bourdieu's followers tried to maintain him as a reference. They argued that his contribution is not about what we should or can do, but that he discovered that schools have the tendency to reproduce the inequalities, and that most rich pupils have better results than most poor pupils. On the one hand, this is not a discovery, since years before Bourdieu was born even illiterate citizens knew this. On the other hand, Bourdieu's book does not say that most schools

reproduce inequalities, but that schools reproduce inequalities, and they do not have the option to overcome them.

We cannot even imagine fields of sciences like health having an author who has not contributed any new knowledge or improved the health of at least one citizen as a relevant reference. In these fields, those taken as a reference are the authors and theories that are creating new knowledge and contributing to the improvement of citizens' health. Conversely, in the fields of education and social sciences, there are scholars and professionals who are guided by Bourdieu's reproduction theory and other theories that do not improve educational results in schools and have not created any new knowledge. Many teachers and professors come from families with a low socioeconomic status. They have parents who have not completed secondary school, yet they have completed university degrees and have jobs as educators. Why then do they follow deterministic theories that say that the cause of academic results is the socioeconomic status and the academic background of the families?

Even Bourdieu himself was the son of a postman and he climbed up the social and academic structure by being a good student. A woman publicly accused him of having used her to gain access to her father, who was at the time the leading French sociologist. It is clear that this sociologist promoted Bourdieu to become famous and was later criticised by the reproduction author. In any case, Bourdieu became an upper middle-class sociologist because he was a good student in school, not because his family was rich and highly educated.

After abandoning the structuralist base of reproduction (as he himself acknowledged), he wrote what is probably his most famous book, titled "The distinction" [102], which includes his concept of *habitus*. He links taste to the cultural capital derived from the *habitus*. This led his followers to attribute the motivation for opera to the upper classes and for pop music to the lower classes. When the former president of the American Sociological Association, Erik Olin Wright, learnt about the successful cultural action called Dialogic Literary Gatherings, he said that its results proved Bourdieu wrong in his concept of distinction. Michael Apple wrote about them [137]: "(…) women enable new alliances to be built that allow for mutual respect

over religious differences, give women a sense of cultural power, and create the possibility of women's agency in other aspects of their lives. It is also very visible in CREA's equally creative efforts with youth and minoritized groups" (p. 158).

With this action, poor people from all continents with a low academic background get motivated and understand books like "The Arabian nights" or "Ulysses" by James Joyce much better than many rich people with a PhD do. The consequence of researching and getting citizens to know about this successful cultural action is to use it to make steps to overcome the cultural inequalities they suffer from. The consequence of Bourdieu's concepts of distinction and *habitus* is to consider that these people will never develop motivation and comprehension of humanity's best creations. Therefore, instead of overcoming cultural inequalities, these concepts create prejudices against people who are economically poor or have low levels of schooling.

In a very different perspective, other sociologists value the voices of all citizens instead of looking down on them. Alain Touraine and Michel Wieviorka participated in a meeting of the European Scientific Study "Workalo" [138]. In one of the sessions, the concept of mixed identities was explained: "As a result of Arab migration in France, mixed identities emerge, people who are 50% French and 50% Algerian". One Roma woman, without a university degree, disagreed saying: "I am not 50% French and 50% Romà, I am 100% French, I have the same rights and duties as any other French person, and I am also 100% Romà". Authors answered recognizing the need to revise and improve the sociological concept of mixed identities taking into account this contribution. Egalitarian dialogue not only improves the culture and the lives of all citizens without discrimination, but it also improves the excellence of sociological concepts.

The first error in Bourdieu's analysis is the confusion between correlation and causation. The second is that he put on opaque lenses that prevented him from seeing the people who, coming from the upper classes, hate opera or, coming from the lower classes, love it. This is the case of some women who participate in Dialogic Literary Gatherings, who said: "I have the impression that Bourdieu has never directly read books like Joyce's Ulysses". The third is to project low expectations on those who come from low socioeconomic

families, thus preventing them from developing a taste for so-called "high culture". The fourth is the inability to analyse his own process and even the tendency to try to hide his origin; this can be seen in the fact that most of his followers do not know his father was a postman, despite giving so much importance to social origin. The fifth is not knowing that each person is unique and that every group is a simplification that only partly explains their behaviour. When this knowledge is not properly considered, evident mistakes are made.

The current emphasis of international scientific programmes on social impact and co-creation promotes the concept of successful actions. Drawing on this, sociology and other social sciences are doing the key change in their history and are collaborating much more than ever for the creation of knowledge of all scientific fields and for the improvement of the lives of citizens and societies. Brilliant young scholars are deciding not to have authors that have not contributed to social improvements and/or the creation of new knowledge as a reference. They consider such behaviour a sort of hooliganism to justify laziness and ignorance. Some education professionals who do not improve the results of their schools find justification in the determinism of the reproduction theory that affirms the impossibility of making this improvement. Some lazy scholars who do not make research or theories and practices that overcome cultural inequalities find justification in the concepts of distinction and *habitus,* denying the possibility of transforming these disparities.

Beyond ideological ignorance

Humans have two ways of interacting: with dialogue or with violence; a third one has not yet been invented. One or the other makes the difference between war and peace, between sexual aggression and freedom. Wars and femicides are not isolated incidents, independent of the world in which they occur; they cannot be eradicated with the sole dialogue among governments or the technical intervention of professionals. On the contrary, they are tips of an iceberg of daily violence that invades us from our earliest years.

Within the three classic spheres (ethics, science, and aesthetics) of human society, some need dialogic consensus. It is impossible to organise social life without an agreement about what is good and bad in human relationships. For instance, rape is bad and free sexual relationships are good; without this agreement supported by society, it would be impossible to even have a safe walk home from high school. We also need dialogic consensus about what is true and what is false; as the great semiotician specialist Umberto Eco criticised to Derrida, if everything is relative, it would be impossible to meet each other in a specific city, because maybe one of the two people thinks that the city does not exist. If I make an appointment with another person to meet at the airport at 4pm, we should be sure that we understand the same about this place and this time.

Most people using the word "deconstruction" attributing it to Derrida have never read the most important books by Derrida, such as "Of Grammatology" [139]. They do not know that this concept, as Derrida recognized, comes from the concept of "Destruktion" elaborated by Heidegger, who was the main Nazi intellectual. They do not know the role played by Derrida's friend De Man in the concept of deconstruction, who published Nazi articles during Hitler's occupation of Belgium. They do not know that deconstruction does not mean destroying something (for instance, democracy) to construct something better, but only to destroy it. They do not know that this concept has been the basis Nazis have used to try to destroy the truth about the existence of the Nazi extermination camps, because any truth should be deconstructed. They do not know that deconstruction of truth means that we cannot affirm it is true that the city where we live exists. They do not know that presenting those kinds of statements as if they were social "theory" makes citizens defend not funding social sciences because it is better to employ those resources in much more important things like improving health and education.

Scientists contribute both to the creation of scientific knowledge and to the improvement of society. However, some mass media that sometimes prefer scandals to truths present as social scientists people who, instead of telling the truth, give their ideological opinions or their hoaxes as if they were science. In this way, they discredit the social sciences to such an extent that there are many voices, both in positions of power in governments and among

citizens themselves, that consider those social sciences useless and are predisposed to cut their funding.

Just as an example, many universities frequently organised debates with a large number of students in their centres of political sciences and other social sciences just days before the invasion of Ukraine. In these debates, renowned intellectuals explained categorically why it was ultra-certain to say that there was not going to be an invasion, ridiculing those who believed there would be an invasion as being manipulated by US propaganda. A few days after, when the invasion had already occurred, events were again organised in the same places and with the same audience and speakers in which they explained why the invasion had taken place, without the slightest questioning of their ways of analysing reality. It was very clear that all those speakers were not contributing any scientific analysis of society, but reaffirming their ideological position, which in their opinion justified saying just the opposite in both events. To look at society through ideologies rather than through the social sciences means putting on opaque glasses that prevent them from seeing and understanding social reality. All intelligent students of any ideology were faced with the dilemma of devoting themselves to something more serious or profoundly transforming the social sciences.

In many universities, Foucault is held as a key inspiration of feminism and Simone de Beauvoir is taught as being the creator of modern feminism. When brilliant young students discover that both signed documents in favour of the decriminalisation of sexual relationships between adults and minors, and that de Beauvoir was removed from teaching because of pederasty, they have the dilemma between not believing any of this or looking for intellectuals who are coherent in what they say and what they do. Outstanding students know that de Beauvoir acknowledged that she discovered and learned feminism in 1947 from North American scholars. They also know that while she was working for the Vichy government (collaborationist with the Nazis), members of the Free Women movement [140] were in the resistance and defended a much more advanced feminism than hers. They consider the false statements situating de Beauvoir as the creator of modern feminism with her book "The Second Sex" [11] ridiculous, and they discover that most of those saying this they have not read the book.

The ideological ignorance gets followers in the habit of talking and writing about what they have never read and debated. They are not motivated and capable of analysing theoretical works. They do not even read the main intellectual works they consider as being within their own ideology. This provokes anti-Nazi "intellectuals" who are followers of the main Nazi intellectual in history (Heidegger) [141,142]. There are also "intellectuals" proclaiming themselves to be democrats and/or socialists who are followers of Nietzsche, the main intellectual enemy of both democracy and socialism, besides the equality of women's rights [9]: "The preponderance of the mandarins never indicates anything good: any more than the rise of democracy, international courts of arbitration instead of wars, equal rights for women, the religion of compassion and everything else that is a symptom of life in decline." (p. 114).

Throughout the history of humankind, there have been extraordinary theoretical and practical contributions that have led to the creation of important international organisations, to seek the elimination of wars and to include sexual freedom in democratic constitutions as a principle that society must defend against any aggression or coercion. However, much of the academia and the social sciences have not been up to the task, plunging citizenry into confusion, which creates threats and uncertainties for society about its future and for adolescents about how to situate themselves in the world. Most citizens think that diverse natural scientists say the same truth about many important questions, but on the contrary, diverse social scientists say the opposite of one another because they do not do science, but ideology.

Over the course of many years, I had to correct speakers more than 40 times at different conferences for their attribution of the following famous lines to Bertolt Brecht: "First they came for the Communists. And I did not speak out. Because I was not a Communist (…) Then they came for the Jews (…) Then they came for me. And there was no one left to speak out for me". I always clarified that they were written by theologian Martin Niemöller. At first, the speakers reaffirmed that it had been Brecht, not because they had any evidence of it, but because they preferred it to come from a communist than from a theologian. After the spread of the Internet, it was impossible to deny it, and when I said it, they corrected it in that conference, but they would

say it again in the next one. Fortunately, citizen dialogue has allowed almost anyone to no longer say such fake things. There are many similar cases alike.

All those who do not know the difference between ideology and science are as ignorant about society as are the flat-earthers. The Renaissance's scientific revolution was possible thanks to the distinction Copernicus's "De Revolutionibus" made between ideology (religion) and science. Those authors who still support the idea that everything is politics are so reactionary that they go back to the historical period before the Renaissance. Intellectuals who categorically stated that there would be no invasion of Ukraine and days later explained why there had been one without rectifying their methodology of the analysis of reality are practising ideological ignorance, not creation of knowledge; they are neither scientists nor intellectuals. Their consideration as authors of social sciences harms society and destroys social sciences.

Analemma of variables

Social sciences are very difficult because human behaviour involves many factors that are impossible to isolate in a laboratory and, therefore, causal relationships cannot be established by isolating objective variables. Statistical analyses, increasingly being improved, only avoid falling into elementary errors of interpretation if they are aware of their limitations. All excellent statisticians know that the variables they have considered in their analysis are only part of the existing ones and that some of them were not even imagined.

For a long time, it was claimed that women had more conservative values than men, which was a consequence of excellent statistics wrongly interpreted. This elementary error and prejudice led to such sexist and anti-democratic consequences as women deputies on the left denying other women the right to vote for the right [143]. The simple consideration of a previously unexplored variable immediately undid this prejudice. Making distinctions between women who worked only at home and those who also worked outside their homes showed that the latter had fewer conservative values than men. Therefore, what generated more conservative values was

not being a woman but having or not the option to access a job outside their homes.

In the sixties, authors such as Coleman confused correlation with causation, and from the reality that most rich students obtained better results than most poor students, they deduced that education was not useful for overcoming inequalities [144]. The truly scientific analyses that introduced the variable of whether or not successful educational actions were implemented in their schools showed that (as in the previous case of sex and values) the results did not depend on the objective variable of socioeconomic level, but on the subjective variable of the actions carried out. The social impact of this mistake is very negative. Teachers knowing the influence of the subjective variables are achieving school success with poor children. Teachers thinking that the Coleman report is true do not achieve success with their students because they are made to believe it is impossible.

Throughout the 19th and 20th centuries, a rich debate has been clarifying some wrong approaches to those kinds of interpretations. Although some authors and professionals are still making those mistakes such as the aforementioned confusion between correlation and causation, many statistics professors clarify this error with clear and funny examples. One of these examples shows a village where there is a high rate of births and there are also many storks; the confusion between correlation and causation would lead to conclude that the storks bring the babies. This is a ridiculous mistake that also makes authors conclude that being a woman makes a person more conservative than a man, or that the cause of school failure is being born in a poor family.

Undergraduate sociology students in one university complained about their statistics professor. Most students failed the course because they did not understand the content. They thought the professor knew a lot and they did not reach his level because they already had difficulties in high school and had no motivation for mathematics. One of these students had the highest qualifications in mathematics in high school and she understood all the contents, not because of the professor's explanations, but because of her own consultation of the handbook. Despite doing very well on all problems and questions, she only got a B; no one got an A. She said that she already knew

more statistics than this professor, but he thought that the only way to maintain his image of knowing a lot was to fail most of the students, to give a C to a few of them and, very occasionally, a B to one of them.

The reality was that this professor himself was not good in mathematics at school; this was the reason why he chose to study social sciences. He dedicated himself to social statistics with a certain insecurity and admiration for those who have mastered statistics, a problem that he projected onto his students by considering them to be very ignorant in these subjects. He was one of those who attribute so much magical power to statistics that he tried to extract from them the causal relationships of social phenomena through an endless process of isolating variables; one of the limits of this process is the non-consideration of many intervening variables. The result of these studies, sometimes highly valued in the media and socially, is very poor and very negative in terms of social impact (i.e., social improvement) and policy impact (development of policies that achieve social impact), although rich in terms of remuneration and promotion of those who sign them.

Another wrong way was the development in the sixties of a struggle between quantitative and qualitative research, trying to move students to be in favour of one of them and against the other. Fortunately, this struggle has already been overcome by brilliant researchers and professionals in the last decades. Quantitative and qualitative research are like reason and sentiments. We need both reason and sentiments to develop the goodness dimension of beauty, and we need both qualitative and quantitative research in order to create knowledge about this beautiful and good world.

There have been proposals to use other concepts instead of "cause" for social sciences [81]. Accepting that in the study of humans it is impossible to isolate variables without forgetting other variables, some social scientists have tried to develop new concepts that in some cases make fruitful contributions but do not solve the problem. The solutions cannot be found considering only the social sciences but widening the minds to all sciences. One of those solutions is the focus on successful actions that, even though we do not know all the variables, scientific evidence show are successful in diverse contexts.

We have learned a lot during the COVID-19 pandemic. Without having totally clarified the process in which this new coronavirus appeared or why it infects some people more than others, science has created vaccines that are successful in the prevention and protection of the disease, although not in all cases. The creation of those vaccines and their administration to human beings is not postponed to the clarification of all or most of the variables. In a similar perspective, an increasing number of social scientists are analysing and sometimes creating successful actions in education, employment, housing, poverty, and other social issues.

Social sciences are born and part of democracies

It was only two centuries ago that, with democracies, citizens decided to govern themselves and, in order to do so better, to know themselves; it is in this context that the social sciences were created. Sociology is a daughter and part of democracies. Democracy in its turn is the daughter of pluralism. Parsons, among others, has shown that democracy began due to the need for dialogue and consensus on the rules of coexistence between people and groups of different religions, origins, ethnic groups, and languages. This is also accepted by both sides of the liberalism-republicanism debate [145], as it is why modern democracy began in a country as diverse as the United States, where people from the most different backgrounds had arrived [146].

As has already been said, in the democratic revolutions, citizens and societies decided to self-govern themselves, and to do this properly, to get self-knowledge about themselves. Sociology and all social sciences were created with this objective. In order to maintain and promote citizens' participation, democratic societies need the self-knowledge provided by sociology. When there is an increasing improvement of the participation of social groups previously excluded or marginalised (for instance, gender identities or ethnic groups), societies and citizens look for sociology's contributions. Not by chance, until 1920 sociology was mainly a discipline of the rich democratic countries. Now, there are excellent sociological productions in countries from the five continents, although the ones of greater international impact are elaborated in democratic countries like India or the USA.

There are also degrees, research, and publications of sociology developed in dictatorships, but with strict limitations to academic freedom in teaching, research, and publications. Ideological imposition makes most sociological works under dictatorships very poor, with little international impact, and they are mostly abandoned when the dictatorial regime is replaced by a democracy. Of course, some sociologists have also elaborated excellent sociological works under dictatorships, but with very little dissemination in their own countries as well as internationally.

With some prominent precedents, sociology started to be important in Spain under Franco's dictatorship. It was created by catholic institutions and persons with a popular orientation. The first sociology degree in Spain was founded in Deusto, a Jesuit university, in 1963. Every year, several Jesuits went first to study sociology at Deusto and then to some of the top universities in the USA and Europe such as Columbia or Leuven. The following years, sociology was developed in several parts of Spain with good international training and committed to the democratic movements against the dictatorship.

Franco's regime was not interested in sociology and did not like it. Instead, Serrano Suñer (Franco's brother-in-law and the most pro-Hitler member of the regime) created the Instituto de Estudios Políticos (Institute of Political Studies) in order to intellectually support the ideology of the dictatorship, especially its Nazi dimension. With the objective of destroying the democratic sociology, members of the Franco regime founded a degree of sociology at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid in 1973. Since then, the selection of full-time professors of sociology in all Spanish universities was made by these prominent members of the Franco regime and by those who accepted a subordinate alliance with them during the political transition to democracy. What they called sociology were their own ideas. Of course, none of their publications obtained any international sociological recognition, but Spanish students of sociology had the obligation to buy and read them.

If we accept the name of sociology as the ideology and ideas of the members of their regimes, we can say that there is sociology in dictatorships. But if we properly attribute the name of sociology to the sociological knowledge

elaborated and recognised by the international scientific community, most of what is considered sociology in dictatorships is just authoritarian ideology. At the beginning of the political transition to democracy, it can partially subsist, but when the democracy is more consolidated this "sociology" is replaced by sociology. This is what has happened in Spain (and other previous dictatorships). Current scientific and social transformations have opened the space for Spanish sociologists that make contributions which are very valued internationally and with social impact in their own countries.

There is a much higher correlation between the dictatorial or democratic regime of the country and the contributions to sociology than the contributions to physics. No science is independent of political regimes, but human sciences have more limits because dictators try to use their names for disseminating their own ideas, as well as because they do not want to present citizens any kind of empirical data about the social reality, unless the data and/or their interpretation are arbitrarily selected, manipulated, and distorted. The "sociologists" trained and accustomed to this kind of work become contaminated by this sort of manipulation and most of them continue that way forever. This is one of the reasons why the sociology in their countries improves when they are replaced by other kinds of persons and researchers.

In the case of Spain this manipulation is so clear that still today most professors say that the first sociology degree in Spanish universities was the one founded by members of Franco's regime in 1973 at the Universidad Complutense. There are already enough publications presenting all sorts of evidence showing that the first degree was founded in 1963 at Deusto, and that many sociologists had obtained this degree before 1973. Nevertheless, even the Spanish Federation of Sociology continues to publicly say the wrong date and university. To recognise the truth would mean to revise and rectify what they have said and written for forty years.

Beyond opaque individualism

Natural sciences authors are used to working collectively in teams, networks, co-authoring research projects and publications, and training young scholars that can become equal or better than them. This fosters the excellence of their

discoveries and their friendly relationships. The Argentinian Bernardo Houssay received the Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine due to the discovery of the pituitary hormone's function in sugar metabolism. He made research and publications collectively and promoted younger scholars like Luis Federico Leloir who, working with little resources, got the Nobel Prize in Chemistry for his discovery of the metabolic pathways in lactose. Like many other scientists, Houssay took a public position against Nazism in 1943 and in favour of science and democracy in Argentina. This resulted in the loss of his position at the University of Buenos Aires, and he had to leave his country, although he could later return. Leloir supported Houssay in every moment and, when he received tempting offers to work with more resources in other countries, he made the option to do research and promote institutions and juniors in Argentina.

Differently, most authors used as main references in social sciences and humanities work and publish individually despite the negative consequences for their scientific and social impact. In Section III of "The Theory of Communicative Action", Habermas says that his analysis of communication is mostly based on Austin's speech theory, although not directly from Austin's writings, but through Searle's writings [147], who was the main follower and friend of Austin. In page 439, Habermas says: "I shall leave aside the development that speech act theory (see my "What is Universal Pragmatics?", pp. 44ff.) and take as my point of departure the interpretation that Searle has given to this theory. John Searle, *Speech Acts* (London, 1969); and D. Wunderlich, *Studien zur Sprechakt-theorie* (Frankfurt, 1976)".

For those who have had no time to profoundly analyse these authors' texts, it could be surprising to know that Searle wrote that Habermas's interpretation of Austin's concepts and of his own concepts was totally wrong. These kinds of situations, very common in the social sciences of the past, scandalise scientists from different disciplines. Of course, in the current 21st century, it is impossible to elaborate individually the excellent social theories needed by both society and social sciences; we are already overcoming those kinds of problems: a) Why did Habermas not talk to Searle in order to avoid his mistaken reading of the concepts of Searle and of Searle's friend Austin? b) Why, four decades later, is there no public rectification by Habermas or, on the contrary, a response arguing for his

interpretations? Searle wrote and published in 2004 [148]: "Habermas does not understand Austin's distinction between locutionary and illocutionary acts. He thinks it is the same as my distinction between propositional content and the illocutionary force of the illocutionary act (...) Habermas does not understand the distinction between illocutionary and perlocutionary, and this misunderstanding is essential to his whole conception of communicative action (...) Why does he make these mistakes? Because he thinks that the illocutionary act is inevitably and intrinsically directed to the goal of reaching agreement and persuasion (...) he focuses his efforts on making consensus (which is a perlocutionary effect) part of the definition of the illocutionary act (...) Habermas's biggest problem is that he does not understand the taxonomy of illocutionary acts".

This situation is one more clear proof that dialogic social science and any other social science made in collaboration among different authors and disciplines can reach a much higher intellectual and scientific level than any other theory of social science made individually. Habermas's errors could be rectified before the publication of "The Theory of Communicative Action" if Habermas had had a dialogue with Searle. After the publication of the book with the errors, they could be overcome not only through a dialogue between Habermas and Searle, but also with an open debate of authors that are supposed to be specialists in those kinds of theories.

Habermas is one of the people who has read the most literature on social thought, but all that a single person can read in a lifetime is only a small part of what is necessary to know in order to make a social theory that does not fall into elementary errors. We have chosen this case because it clearly demonstrates that, in the new millennium, creating social theory individually is impossible without key errors that limit its intellectual excellence, its social impact, and its contribution to other diverse sciences. This is precisely a key case because Habermas is one of the most intelligent intellectuals and so rigorous that in the 70s he decided to learn French in order to read authors and theories he wanted to analyse and criticise in their original language. He was a student of French in the same group as very young and unknown students, and he had a very good and egalitarian relationship with them. If even such an intellectual has elemental errors, who will not have them?

When working individually and not dialogically, not only the writing of the books, but also their reading is often done in a very superficial way and without perceiving the errors. For example, on page 375 of one of the Spanish versions of the "The Theory of Communicative Action" [135], it says: "Solo pueden conseguirse efectos ilocucionarios por medio de los actos de habla si estos quedan incluidos *a fuer de medios* en acciones teleológicas, en acciones orientadas al éxito". In reality, these are perlocutionary effects, not illocutionary ones, as is clarified on page 292 of the English edition: "perlocutionary effects can be achieved by way of speech acts only if the latter are *incorporated as means* into actions oriented to success" [132]. No one realises this error, not only the many who talk about this book, but also the few who read it. Therefore, the error was not corrected and remains in later editions [149].

Besides mistakes, working individually makes it impossible to resolve very relevant human intellectual problems even by the authors that have been intelligent enough to formulate them. For instance, in his book "The Transformation of Intimacy" [98], Giddens raises this crucial question: "Why can't a good man be sexy; why can't a sexy man be good?" (p. 156). Without the collaboration with authors of feminism and new masculinities it is impossible to scientifically analyse why and to contribute with solutions. Moreover, reading this scientific literature could avoid some of his affirmations that can be understood as a justification for the sexist disdain of some womanizers towards the women with whom they have just had sex [98]: "a man who is fluent and assured when going through his seduction routine might find himself awkward, tongue-tied and desperate to get away once the sexual act is over" (p. 84). Of course, the publications by those authors are available, but one individual author cannot read the main bibliography of all the needed issues to develop a scientific theory of society.

The only solution is that social scientists work like other scientists, not in individual isolation but in teams or networks of different people, with different knowledges, experiences, ideologies, religions, sexual orientations, and cultural identities. This is already a growing trend among social scientists; up to 60% of articles in this field are already co-authored [150] and most research groups are including gender and ethnic diversity among their members. The traditional individualism can still be found much more

among the authors that have been more famous and quoted until now but who are taken less and less into account in the social science projects with more scientific, policy, and social impact. The old traditional motivation of becoming famous in social sciences is now being replaced by a motivation for making contributions that can be used by scientists from very different natural and social fields, for co-creating knowledge for citizens and organisations to get social impact, that is, improvement in the lives of all kinds of people. In the past, becoming famous could be achieved and even facilitated by working individually, but making real contributions for the diversity of sciences and for improving society requires interdisciplinarity and networks of collaboration.

There are many examples about how dialogue creates intellectual and scientific excellence impossible to get individually. Nobel Laureates Stanley Cohen and Rita Levi Montalcini said: "you and me are good, but together we are wonderful". The criterion of co-creation has outlined how this dialogue should be not only among researchers from different disciplines and in order to know more and more diverse scientific literature, but also with very different people with very diverse personal trajectories and experiences. Judith Butler wrote about her dialogues with Lidia Puigvert and the Roma women working with Lidia [151]: "it will change me and my work (...) you have returned me to my most basic sense of why feminism is urgent, moving and inspiring" (p. 90).

The Expressive Revolution

Parsons wrote most of his nicest words developing his concept of expressive revolution [152]: "I think this movement must point in the direction of a lessening of the stress on self-interest in the traditional utilitarian sense, of a strong reinforcement of the affective solidarity-that is, love-of individuals for each other, and of revival of the sense of collective solidarity." (p. 321). It is very satisfying to read that he considers that those values are at the same time traditional and new. On the one hand, he says we have always had them: "In a certain sense we have always valued solidary human relationships, community in some sense, and love relationships" (p. 320). On the other hand, he suggests his hope for a much better realisation of these values

through the expressive revolution: "I suggest that the expressive revolution is bringing about an enhanced valuation of this latter set of components of the value system" (p. 320).

In some of my university studies, I was taught that the works by Parsons, Merton and other functionalists were not sociology, but rather ideology at the service of capitalism. Although I never supported this interpretation, I still recognise now in my memories to what extent it influenced me; in Spanish there is a famous quote: "calumnia que algo queda" (if you throw enough mud, some sticks). When Merton invited me to his home, while he was bringing tea for me, I was feeling he was not only a great author but also a wonderful person with much better sentiments than those telling ugly lies about him. My main intellectual interest at this moment was to talk about the errors in Habermas's interpretation of Parsons's work, as Merton was the author more personally linked to Parsons and who knew his trajectory and publications better. Merton was very upset in general with the mistakes Habermas made in the "The Theory of Communicative Action" about Parsons's contributions.

We talked about different dimensions of Parsons's work and trajectory, including Wright Mills's divergence with him, but we could also dialogue about other and diverse themes, from ageing to democracy. I told Merton that some of the Marxists that criticised him as rightist without reading his works at that time were hooligans of the Nazi Heidegger, of his followers like Michel Foucault or Hannah Arendt. On the contrary, Merton was a clear democratic person. It was very inspiring for me to listen to the creator of sociology of science talk about Kuhn's concept of paradigm or why there is not a Nobel Prize for sociology (a few years later, his son Robert Cox Merton received the Nobel Prize for Economics).

He knew nothing about Spanish sociology, and he did not even know that his book "The Sociology of Science" was published in Spanish; I bought one in a bookstore in Bilbao to give it to him. I could react criticising him of ethnocentrism and of dismissing the Spanish productions in sociology, but at that time sociology in Spain was controlled by a feudal lobby which destroyed all those acting against the sexual harassment and in favour of creating sociological productions excellent enough to be appreciated

internationally. Years later, when I asked him to accept one of my students from the University of Barcelona as his student of an independent study for her master's at Harvard, he answered very positively. He was much more supportive to her than most of the Spanish *catedráticos* (full professors). Elisenda Giner has published that the Spanish *catedrático,* then considered the best one in sociological theory, recognised publicly that he had never read Parsons [153].

Thanks to Merton, I could appreciate the admiring dedication of Parsons to consolidate democracy against anti-democratic movements like Nazism and Stalinism, and I could understand the evolution of his works. I bought all his books, and several colleagues and I dedicated two years to read and discuss them. We could then understand his compromise with democracy and to what extent his contributions to the concepts of societal community and expressive revolution were important for Europe and the world. In fact, among the most quoted authors in sociology, he was the one to publish (with other authors), already in the sixties, the book "The Negro American" [125], in which already in 1964 he included a definition and analysis of societal community (p.709). Its reference to the societal community was an attempt to take into account the African American movement in social sciences, although of course his approach is far from what now is co-creation and from the current contributions by authors from different cultures.

Parsons was a far-sighted author; he foresaw the difficulties of building the European Union and the integration into it of the different European states and populations. One characteristic of the needed societal community was diversity, and there was more diversity in the USA than in Europe [125]: "It may be said that there was sufficient ethnic and religious uniformity to make solidarity possible, but enough diversity to favour a major shift towards the associational basis of that solidarity, as compared with the European analogues" (p. 711).

Of course, now we need a conception of societal community and even of diversity different from the one Parsons contributed to us but taking it into account. Societal community is now, day by day, built with dialogue among a diversity of citizens who reach a consensus on common principles that enhance their different identities, for example, through promoting

affirmative actions for certain groups. In the US top universities, these types of measures in favour of inclusion are better spread and accepted by people from different ethnic groups, while affirmative actions are more radically rejected still today in most parts of Europe.

The expressive revolution is a great path to the development of societal community. Communities such as the United States, the European Union, the UN or any other from Asia, Africa, or elsewhere are more solid when its principles of coexistence have not arisen from previous postulates of each religion, ethnic group, or country, but from the dialogue between all these diverse groups, resulting in principles of a higher order than all the previous ones. In this sense, Parsons was right about the European Union having a much greater difficulty in being integrated into a common identity than the United States did, where diversity made it necessary to reach a higher consensus. Europe starts from a greater homogeneity in the main power groups in each of its countries, which hinders the "expressive revolution" that is necessary for its integration. Societal community is built with dialogue among a diversity of citizens who reach a consensus on common principles that enhance their different identities.

Habermas abandoned his attempt to give a communicative orientation to the concept of societal community, therefore failing to make an extraordinary intellectual contribution to the construction of the European community. The abandonment of this fruitful path led him to a rapid change of direction toward a concept of constitutional patriotism. In his main book ("The Theory of Communicative Action" [154]) he wrote about his reaction to Parsons's writings he had read: "What we then find vexing is the fact that Parsons introduces the system of the basic conditions of human existence intention recta by way of supplementing the action system with three additional subsystems" (p. 255). "These three revolutions can be explained (...) as structural differentiations of the subsystem of the societal community from the economic, the political, and the cultural subsystems." (p. 285). "Parsons, System of Modern Societies, p. 101. This construction is not at all convincing. If, following this line, we correlate the three revolutions mentioned above with the economic, political, and cultural subsystems, we should expect one further revolution for the integrative subsystem—perhaps this is what Parsons calls the "Expressive Revolution" in "Religion in

Postindustrial America," in Action Theory and the Human Condition (New York, 1978), pp. 300-322, here pp. 320-22" (p. 427-428).

In the midst of European construction, many people and organisations expected the most prestigious intellectuals of the time to make some proposals that would help consolidate the European Union. It came as a surprise when Habermas proposed what he called "constitutional patriotism", which some saw as the disappearance of the patriotism of countries and regions and its replacement by a single patriotism of the constitution that was agreed upon by citizens. Those who had rigorously read his books consider it strange that Habermas did not take into account some of Parsons's last publications [146,155].

Socioneuroscience. Every person can be the architect of their own brain

The advances made by neuroscience in the understanding of the human brain have been extraordinary. Santiago Ramón y Cajal [156], winner of the Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine in 1906 for his "doctrine of the neuron", is considered the father of modern neuroscience. Among his contributions, the hypothesis of brain plasticity has been and remains the cornerstone of this discipline. Brain plasticity is the "ability of synapses, neurons or brain regions to change their properties in response to use or different stimulation profiles" [55].

From Ramón y Cajal to the present day, neuroscience research has shown that it is social experience that changes the brain. In Kandel's words [55], "Even though I had long been taught that the genes of the brain are the governors of behaviour, the absolute masters of our fate, our work showed that, in the brain as in bacteria, genes are also servants of the environment" (p.310). Studies of twins with identical genetic load have proved to be the best laboratory for testing the power of social experience on brain development and functioning. As Kandel [55] also points out, since each twin has different social experiences, i.e., different social relationships, their brains are different, showing the imprint of one's life history (p. 258).

The plastic nature of the brain allows us to understand the different impacts of human relationships of varying quality on brain functioning and health. Advances in the technology employed, such as fMRI (functional magnetic resonance imaging), have shown that toxic human relationships, including some form of violence, alter not only learning, memory, attention, etc., but can even change the architecture of the brain, leading to a reduction in the size of subcortical structures, loss of neural connections and neuronal death. In contrast, studies such as the Harvard Study of Adult Development, the longest longitudinal research to date on adult development, have indicated that quality human relationships are more influential on health performance, including brain health, than other factors such as genetics, IQ, or social class [157]. Given the importance of environments, experiences, and social interactions in brain development and functioning, Santiago Ramón y Cajal [158] pointed out that "every person can be, if he or she sets his or her mind to it, the architect of his or her own brain".

These statements by the founder of modern neuroscience and its main specialists make it clear that the study of the brain requires an interdisciplinary approach in which the sciences dedicated to the study of social experiences, among others, are key. Until recently, neuroscience had almost exclusively used the knowledge of certain currents of psychology, mainly behaviourism. For example, Kandel, in the book "In Search of Memory" [55], writes explicitly that William James, Thorndike, Pavlov, Skinner, Ulric Neisser and Freud, who had investigated learning and memory, had a considerable influence on his work. He noted that the thinking of these psychologists, and even their errors, provided a wonderfully rich cultural background for Kandel's later work. He even states that, despite his errors, Freud has made contributions to modern neuroscience (the unconscious, the human psyche and the continuum between normal mental life and mental illness) and that in general his most original and influential idea is that mental activity adheres to scientific laws. But in his seminal book "Principles of Neural Science" [1], as well as in "In Search of Memory" [55], his main and diverse references are made to Pavlov, Thorndike, and Skinner, and specifically to their research on reflective learning, pointing out that such behaviourist research was crucial for the neuroscientific understanding of implicit memory.

A study of the American Psychological Association [159] considered Skinner the most influential psychologist of the 20th century. This author receives one of the most radical and widespread criticisms in social theory, almost always from those who have not read any of his books. This rejection towards the author is so visceral that it extends to those who quote Skinner or say that some of his contributions should be taken into account. Many of the people who have this attitude, which they present as so rebellious, demonstrate their ignorance and submission when, nevertheless, they do not present any objection if those who quote him and use his contributions are Nobel Prize laureates in Neuroscience. Those who have been carried away by this trend have the possibility of forming their own criteria by reading and commenting on some of his works [160].

Other contributions from the social sciences have given neuroscientists a deeper and more nuanced understanding, for example, about how negative thought patterns associated with toxic relationships damage human telomeres. Other types of sociological and psychological knowledge allow a deeper understanding of the interactive and sexual-affective socialisation mechanisms underlying recent findings about how different types of relationships, superficial or quality ones, among adolescents wire the brain differently (specifically, the neural reward system) in terms of greater or lesser attraction to risk [161].

Socioneuroscience [162] studies the relationships between the brain and human interactions taking into account the knowledge of all the social sciences and natural sciences. Its field of study is oriented to achieve a better understanding of how and why social interactions change the brain in different healthy and unhealthy directions, and how and why those same changes influence social relationships and, therefore, society. Neuroscience in isolation cannot detect the problems that citizens consider most relevant today, nor can it contribute to the solution of some of them, for example, gender violence.

Understanding the deeper phenomena in people and society that are the object of study of socioneuroscience requires more contributions from the social sciences, not only from behavioural psychology, as well as from other sciences [163]. Studies in the field of preventive socialisation of gender

violence, focused on autobiographical memories of violent sexual-affective relationships, are an example of this. This research in socioneuroscience has explored how a *coercive dominant discourse* (CDD) which associates attraction and desire to men with violent attitudes and behaviours gets internalised by adolescents and adults via social interactions, exposure to the media, readings, etc. As any other learning, the learning of the CDD is reflected in brain anatomy, with new neural connections where it finds its home. Once the CDD has a place in the brain, it is likely that when faced with a stimulus (S) of a man with violent attitudes and behaviours, a girl socialised into this discourse might respond (R) with emotions and an overall physiological response (accelerated beat, greater arousal, major attention, and other reactions in various systems of her organism) of attraction.

The literature in preventive socialisation of gender violence (and more particularly on the construction and development of the CDD), which gathers knowledge from sociology, psychology, anthropology, linguistics, etc., helps understand that such neural, biological, and behavioural response is not innate, but socially learned. This analysis has led to defining such a response of attraction as "enslaved desire" [164], meaning that the emotional reactions that the girl can notice are triggered by certain environmental stimuli, which have the meaning imposed by the CDD. Therefore, her "attraction" is far from being her own response, she is not authoring it, but she is feeling and behaving as the CDD imposes her to. What is more, the CDD can even control her memories, it can influence how past sexual-affective experiences are remembered and interpreted.

Studies on autobiographical memories of violent sexual-affective relationships, which are mostly sporadic (hookups), have shown that often such relationships are remembered with some degree of attraction. This has crucial implications for the girl's emotional development, health, and future life trajectory. Given the prospective functions of autobiographical memories [165], remembering such relationships as attractive increases her likelihood of being revictimized. And this can have devastating consequences for herself, for people who love her and even for her children if she has them in the future. Research on epigenetics has already evidenced the intergenerational transmission of trauma, and breakthrough studies in

social sciences are shedding light on the negative impact that disdainful hookups have on the children of those persons.

Nonetheless, autobiographical memories have the trait of being reconstructive, which means that they can be modified with recall, social interaction, reflection, etc. This is very good news. It means that, following Ramón y Cajal's note on the possibility of every human to be the architect of their own brain, the girl can revise that memory of the disdainful hookup and modify it according to, for example, scientific evidence. In this way, she can liberate the memory from the coercion of the CDD and therefore gain back the agency over her desire. This is already happening.

Scientific research on autobiographical memories of violent sexual-affective relationships has reported this very result as a consequence of very cheap and simple interventions, such as reading a book that presents scientific evidence on love and attraction, including research on CDD and gender violence. After reading some chapters of the book "Radical Love" [166], young female participants who had previously had violent sporadic sexual-affective relationships revised their memories in ways that the later recall led them to feel rejection toward the experience and the man, and some even decided to leave disdainful hookups (if they had them) during the intervention [167].

This is an excellent illustration of how Eric Kandel [55] defines brain plasticity and the power of humans to transform our brains: "If you remember anything of this book, it will be because your brain is slightly different after you have finished reading it. This ability to grow new synaptic connections as a result of experience appears to have been conserved throughout evolution" (p. 162). In deciding to be architects of their own brain, these young women did not only change their memories but also their lives and their futures. The role of social interaction in such experiences is key, and studies in the field of qualitative research methodology have made essential contributions to better understanding the process of "dialogic reconstruction of memory" [168].

Such reconstruction is central in light of the latest findings in neuroscience and epigenetics on what has been called "intergenerational transmission of

trauma". This refers to the phenomenon in which parents, via behaviour, socialise their offspring into patterns of thought, emotions, and behaviour that place them at higher risk of suffering from psychological vulnerability which can affect, in turn, their physical health. Evidence from these studies have shown that many of these children are more prone to have a poorer antidepressive response and report a larger number of symptoms when facing adverse life events. They did not experience the same trauma as their father or mother did, and still, they inherit the consequences of their parents' life trajectories. New research is being conducted in socioneuroscience which shows the intergenerational transmission of trauma resulting from violent sporadic relationships, showing the devastating consequences that the disdainful hookups that some mothers and fathers had in their adolescence and youth have today on the mental and physical health of their children. This places a total new sight on the responsibility every person has over their own life at any stage of development, as it not only affects themselves but also future generations.

Freud, human sexuality, and adulthood

Freud distinguished between human sexuality and animal sexuality. In the first case, he spoke of "trieb" and in the second case of "instinkt", two distinctly different German terms [169]. However, "trieb" is very often translated as "instinct", and a conception of humankind's sexuality that is more closely linked to animal sexuality than the one he actually had is often attributed to Freud.

As is well known, Freud established talking as a central element. He took the basis from the "talking cure" that Breuer had added to Charcot's hypnosis in the treatment of Anna O., the future feminist Bertha Pappenheim. It is not easy to imagine anything more human and less animal than talking, which is a specifically human type of communication and interaction to deal with something as distinct from animals as is our sexuality.

The inadequacies and failures of Freud's conceptions of sexuality are well known, such as the serious sexist statements about female sexuality or homosexuals. Freud elaborated his conception in a hurry to find a therapy

that he managed to turn into a widespread profession by establishing that this talk had to be done with an already psychoanalysed professional. Other conceptions of psychology and other sciences have given more importance to interactions with friends and environments where there is no charge for the talk, and it does not generate a specific profession.

Studying Freud's contributions to the therapy of problems related to humankind's sexuality today requires a multidimensional analysis. Of course, we need specialists in feminism and diverse sexual options, but we also need scientists in other fields. One of them is that of studies on speech acts and communicative acts, and of dialogue in general. Such studies discover the different types of dialogues that improve these problems, and which are not only those held with psychoanalysts, but also with personal, professional, and family environments.

In these studies, we must recover the very important modifications that various professionals of psychoanalysis have been making to the dialogues of psychoanalytic talk. Undoubtedly, Freud is the main author of psychoanalysis, and he made clear contributions to the studies of humans. Nevertheless, psychoanalysis has made great advancements since then, correcting errors and making new elaborations. The contributions to psychoanalysis have not only been made by authors like Erikson, Jung, Adler, Fromm, Reich, Marcuse, or Lacan, but by many psychoanalysts practising their profession.

One of the most interesting complements or modifications of Freud's theory was made by Erik Erikson. Freud classified the human evolution of life in five stages, finalising the fifth one when humans are teenagers. This could generate the wrong idea that this evolution does not continue during adulthood, as also happens with the four stages of Piaget and many other contributions. The omission of further developments during adulthood generates the wrong idea that for the rest of one's life there is only a progressive deterioration of the psycho-affective and cognitive capacities.

These kinds of conceptions have been used to affirm that what happens in childhood with parents tends to be reproduced along one's whole life. One harmful consequence of this has been the hoax stating that those children

whose fathers exercise gender violence tend to do it themselves in their adult life, which provokes the revictimisation of children who are victims since their early ages. This idea forgets that many of those children are killed by their fathers, sometimes while they are defending their mothers; it also forgets that some of the main leaders against gender violence are women and men that suffered it at home during their childhood. This hoax provokes eight-year-old children greatly suffering at home to be classified at schools and in other social contexts as having the tendency to be aggressors in the future.

The study made by Erikson adding three new stages of the life cycle is very fruitful for the analysis of adulthood. Independently of the greater or lesser correctness of his description of those stages, he opened psychoanalysis to the evidence of the continuity of our affective and cognitive evolution during our whole life. This also allowed him to not look only or mainly to the interactions with parents but to all interactions we have throughout our lives. As a consequence of the societal changes in the last years, a ninth stage has been added by different authors. If life expectancy is becoming longer, science should enlarge its glances to be able to analyse the new reality. The book published by Jane M. Erikson [170] includes a ninth stage as an introduction with very interesting details about how Erik and she arrived at the conception of the stages of adulthood.

The lack of analysis about the influence this conception of adulthood received from the previous highly relevant empirical studies of adulthood is surprising. One of the most important of those studies was and is the already mentioned Harvard Study of Adult Development initiated in 1938. Erikson should know it because he had previously been at Harvard Clinical School. It is very common to outline the influence he received from Anna Freud, but she is not the one that led him to arrive at the adult stages.

The same change was done in sociology, among other sciences, also without references to the study initiated in 1938. For many years, socialisation was considered as happening from birth to adulthood. Among others, the great sociologist Peter Berger made the correction of this concept, naming it primary socialisation and establishing the secondary socialisation as the one which continues during adulthood [128]. Berger was working at Boston

College, near Harvard University, but as Erikson he does not explain any influence of the Harvard Study of Adult Development in his conception.

Although the lack of interdisciplinarity is now increasingly overcome, it has been very harmful not only for the progress of sciences, but also for the understanding of how scientific discoveries are made. The walls between disciplines are so strong that sometimes one of them considers an idea as original and revolutionary when in fact it comes at least partially from the other side of the wall. The idea of the continuity of human evolution during adulthood was well known in science before Erikson's or Berger's contributions, but they introduced it in psychoanalysis and sociology, adding new dimensions to this change.

The gifts reserved to old age: Rita Levi-Montalcini

Rita Levi-Montalcini lived very actively for 103 years. Being a neuroscientist who was awarded the Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine, she wrote a book titled "L'asso nella manica a brandelli" (The Ace in the Hole) [171] with the subtitle "The gifts reserved to old age". This brilliant author starts pointing out mistakes and unjustified pessimisms about old age. Mistakes such as the ones in "Gulliver's Travels", which extends to intellectual capacities the deterioration that age does bring to some physiological functions. Some mistakes create unjustified pessimism among some authors, such as Simone de Beauvoir, who relates old age as a sort of shaming secret, as a forbidden subject.

Levi-Montalcini, who does speak and write from the knowledge of the scientific evidence of this matter and with great love for life, says that during old age one can use the "ace in the hole": in the game of life, the highest card is the capacity, in all stages of life but specially in old age life, of making use of one's own mental and psychic capacities. The problem is that the thread of Ariadne in the brain labyrinth is not useful to find the way out, but rather to serve as a guide in the bundle of channels that form the brain labyrinth. Thanks to neural plasticity, the brain makes up for the loss of cells when advancing in age with the property of the other cells of compensating the decrease in number with the increase in ramifications and the use of

alternative neuronal circuits. Hence the importance, with the passing of years, of having lived life intensely.

The hoax about the inevitable brain deterioration, which Levi-Montalcini undoes and clarifies, is one of the weapons of ageism that is based in the dominant discourse about ageing. As in "Gulliver's Travels", it only leaves two options: to live longer with an increasing deterioration that is also brain-related, or to disappear. During the COVID-19 pandemic, ageism affecting life and death situations increased with the use of the age criterion to decide whether to connect or not a person to a respirator. A campaign to collect signatures was promoted first by sociologists from Spain and afterwards at the European level, which managed for some governments (such as the Spanish one) to declare that age could not be used as a criterion. This was positive, but it did not avoid age to be used as a criterion in many cases in practice.

Neuroscience, with the resource of Rita Levi-Montalcini's "The Ace in the Hole", contributes a scientific resource that is key to the analysis of the problem as well as to its solutions, but it is not sufficient. Unlike the isolated neuroscience, socioneuroscience provides all available scientific evidence of social impact from diverse scientific fields. In the democratic societies, one clear objective should be equal rights to choose among the diverse options. As Peter Berger clarifies, freedom in a society is linked to the plurality of options that it offers to citizens. One of them is to have an intense life and to use the "ace in the hole" for overcoming brain deterioration.

An argument used by the dominant discourse is that a consequence of the enlargement of life expectancy is that a lower proportion of labour-active people must sustain with their taxes an increasingly larger proportion of retired people. However, this problem has different economic and social alternatives without cutting the life of those who have the right, if they wish so, to continue enjoying it.

One contribution to this problem is to allow persons to work beyond the current age of retirement if they so wish. Some can have healthy jobs and positively contribute to the productivity of their companies or organisations. This should be facilitated by inclusive communication clarifying that this is

positive for society and for them and avoiding hoaxes such as that they occupy the jobs needed for younger people. The assumed causal relation between being 70 or 90 and receiving a salary from society because they are tired should be overcome. Some of those people can be working, not retired, and can therefore add money to the public retirement funds instead of withdrawing from it. As a result, age will not be the unique indicator to know whether a person has a job or is retired, contributing to overcoming ageism. Another way is to calculate and clarify the non-remunerated work many retired people are doing. A great part of them develops tasks for their families, such as taking care of their grandchildren, as well as voluntary work in many social organisations.

In the mentioned book, Rita Levi-Montalcini dedicates five chapters to five persons with the title of "Sunset or Dawn? Michelangelo, Galileo, Bertrand Russell, Ben-Gurion and Picasso." There are many other people whose wish to work beyond 65 or 70 years old is only rejected by the lack of intelligence of decision-makers. Raising the argument of age to consider that they are not productive anymore, that they are a burden for society because of the deterioration of their capacities, is an error, as the scientific evidence about the brain demonstrates.

Paid, free, and creative work

There are many people who work from Monday to Friday in a company and use some hours of their free time during the weekend in other kinds of non-remunerated works, such as growing vegetables in their garden. In those cases, the work they do from Monday to Friday is because they want to have a salary, not because they enjoy this work, although it is possible to enjoy it and to be paid. This is paid work; most people would not do it if they were not paid. The work they do in the garden, the free work, is because they like to do it and/or they like the product they get from it, like tomatoes or lettuce. They want this product to be consumed at home or to give it to friends, not to sell it for money. This work is not paid, they are free to do it or not, but they do it because they like the process and/or the product; this is free work. Any free work has a creative dimension unless it is done in the context of unequal power relations. Cooking on Sundays could be very creative when

it is done in a home where the distribution of house chores is egalitarian and freely decided, but not when it is a submission to sexist relations determining that women should cook while men watch TV.

The dominant discourse considers some types of work as creative, attributing fun and self-realisation to those doing it. Although this characteristic is frequently linked to some types of free work, it is also assigned to other activities like the ones done by famous painters, even if they are paid a lot for their product; there is the idea that they do not do that for money but for the need they feel to create paintings. All these creative works receive positive feedback and society considers those doing them lucky, as having fun and being self-realised. On the contrary, most works are considered boring and alienating, and the dominant discourse accepts people who do them as paid work but penalise with very negative images those doing them for free. They receive coercion to not do it: for instance, colleagues saying "You work too much, leave this and have fun", "you are submissive to the Judaeo-Christian tradition", "you are a work slave, liberate yourself with me".

Sexist men have traditionally used the images of boring-fun and forced-free as a resource to try to coerce women into doing what they do not desire to do. If a woman does not subdue herself to what a man wants, she will be classified publicly as boring and submissive; if a woman subdues herself to what he wants, she will be classified publicly as fun and liberated. Sexism, classism, and racism are three of the discriminations used as criteria to classify some free work as creative and others as not creative. The dominant discourse classifies as boring or submissive most free works that are done by or in favour of people who are discriminated against by class, race, or gender and oriented to improve their lives or contribute to a better world.

As a consequence of the support of the dominant discourse to certain creative types of work, most people who know that someone does those types of work on the weekends think and say that they do what they like and support that person's decision of doing that. This happens with the activities already classified as arts, like painting. On the contrary, most people do not support creative work when it is intellectual, scientific, or social art. The dominant discourse uses images and words in order to coerce people's free decision,

for instance saying, "you do not know how to have fun" or "you need to take a break" and so on. All those expressions wrongly assume that the ones saying them have more fun or do more interesting things than the people who are doing creative work; in that way, those saying such expressions ignore or try to hide the fact that most creative people have more fun than them when the creative ones do creative work, go to a party, dance in a nightclub and do any other thing because they freely choose what they desire to do at all times. The coerced assumptions try to have an influence on people and force them to do what they did not choose to do and to even develop a self-image of not being fun.

Those assumptions are very submissive to the dominant discourse and have a profound classist, racist, and sexist basis. In the interviews with young girls, many of them explain that *macho* men in nightclubs have told them the kind of expressions like "you do not know how to have fun" when they have said "no" to their proposals, trying to coerce them into doing what they do not want to do. One of the indicators of the class bias of those assumptions and expressions is that the dominant discourse supports a person's activity if they are a famous best-seller writer, but not when they are a reader of high-quality literature books. One indicator of the racist bias is the reaction of the dominant discourse when a person tells other people that they have spent New Year's Eve in a party with the jet set, or in a party with poor Roma people.

The dominant discourse disdains as boring or submissive the voluntary work done taking care of homeless people or the scientific work that improves the lives of all of us. Even if those people insist, they have more fun doing this than watching ugly TV shows, the ones alienated by those shows will press them to watch one of the many announced as "the TV show everybody talks about". Even if those people insist that they are more motivated to do an intellectual work like reading an excellent book than to spend the whole Saturday tanning their bodies at the beach, they will be pressed to do what they do not want to do, and if they do not subdue to the coercion, they will be labelled as boring and submissive.

Even in democracies, freedom is not taken for granted. For most individuals, the only way to be free in each moment is to be sure to avoid those

continuous coercions. People who really have fun watching a TV show or being at the beach do not need to coerce others into doing the same as they do. Those who coerce others to do what they say do so because they are not having fun, and they cannot resist the idea that others are actually having more fun with high-quality activities with plenty of goodness, truth, and beauty.

Most people doing free creative work are used to choosing high-quality activities for their entertainment. They are not puppets consuming what the market presses them to consume. They are free cultured persons who are good for them, their relatives, their friends, and society. The best-seller books and the music continuously launched by the market do not oblige them to not use their time to read the best books and listen to the best music. Those people are from any social class, race, and gender because the taste for quality does not depend on the money or power one has.

Disdainful nightlife

There are some capitalist companies and businessmen that have unscrupulously looked for the maximum profit through the deterioration of citizens' lives. Edward Bernays, a nephew of Sigmund Freud, was one of this kind of businessmen. Until the crack of 1929, very few women smoked and very few of them died of lung cancer. Almost all people who were damaging their health and the health of the passive smokers in their families, friends, and colleagues, were men. Bernays used a curious pseudo-psychoanalytic idea to convince the American Tobacco Corporation to hire him to create a new and large market: selling tobacco to women. On the basis of the statement that women are jealous of men because they do not have a penis, he said that many women were envious of men because they could not use a cylindrical object like a cigarette.

The implementation of this idea has been terribly harmful for women (approximately half a million die every year as a consequence of smoking), but it provided juicy profits to this company and to this businessman. The launch of Bernays's publicity campaign was in the New York Easter Parade. Among the many people dressed in their best clothing, there were some

women smoking who, consciously or unconsciously, were portraying the image that smoking was the symbol of women searching for freedom and equality with men. This aggression against women's health was not followed by most feminists (who opposed the idea that feminism meant doing the worst things that made traditional men submissive to capitalist publicity). Unfortunately, a few of them started to say things like "this woman was a precursor of feminism, she was one of the first ones who dared to smoke".

A similar publicity campaign started in the fifties, promoted by one of the worst and most sexist sectors of businessmen, obtaining very high profits and changing popular culture in many countries worldwide. Before the fifties, young people living with their families and having a job used to give their salary, or part of it, to their families. The nightlife business intended and was successful in making those young people give this money to them rather than to their families. In their pubs and nightclubs there was one of the largest differences in the market between the cost of the product and its price at the bar. A cheap gin booze with tonic water had a price ten times higher than its cost.

An offensive campaign of publicity, films, and concrete labels directly transmitted by peers became verbal guns against freedom of those who desire to have really exciting and fun nightlives with egalitarian persons. In the beginning, many clubs offered free entrance to girls while boys had to pay a ticket. This made it very clear that the product that this business was offering to boys was not mainly the very low-quality drinks, but the girls they could try to hook up with. The coercive discourse was so generalised and without active opposition that participation in it was symbolically like having the "license" for "being fun and exciting", while not participating was labelled as "being boring and useless for sexual-affective relationships". This coercive discourse became dominant in the media, discos, educational centres, sports clubs, and many other spaces.

Feminist studies have demonstrated the disdainful and violent language many boys use to talk about the girls they hooked up with, and how they make such disdain explicit and public throughout their lives. The girls who are confident about their attractiveness do not experience disdainful hookups, they only have sexual relationships with boys who fall in love with

them and/or care and respect them before and after hooking up. Girls with complexes and insecurities, especially when on given nights they feel more insecure for diverse reasons, are more likely to have disdainful hookups (mainly based on the pressure of the sexist business itself). They may first feel they had great success but soon realise that their attractiveness has decreased instead of going up. Feminists have studied the diverse consequences suffered by some of these girls willing to go up in attractiveness who instead go down.

Studies on new masculinities have demonstrated the existence of three different masculinities [172]. Traditional dominant masculinities try to have disdainful hookups and use disdainful and violent language to talk about girls, especially about those with whom they have had hookups. Traditional oppressed masculinities do not want this kind of hookups, but they are submissive to dominant men and sometimes try to imitate them. New alternative masculinities have never treated a girl with disdain because they know and they like the best quality sexual-affective relationships and their human relationships are egalitarian.

Many participants in this kind of nightlife are not aware that it is the capitalist market that pulls all the strings. They even think that such type of amusement is generated by themselves and their rebelliousness. The more ignorant they are about the rules that pull all this, the more they follow the tastes and type of relationships imposed by the coercive discourse. This kind of nightlife has been the main power to spread among many boys and girls the traditional double standard that the worst men have traditionally practised for thousands of years. Those men clearly differentiated between wives and prostitutes. One of the fakes permanently repeated is that traditionally men have had women held in their homes and obliged to be virgins until marriage. Curiously, the same people saying this falseness also say that prostitution is the oldest profession of humanity. The most sexist men never wanted all women to be held in their homes and virgin until marriage. This is what they wanted for one of the types in which they classified women, the ones they wanted to marry and have children with; they wanted the other type of women in their classification always at their disposal for sex.

The disdainful hookups of this kind of nightlife have spread this double standard among many boys and girls. In this regard, Social Media Analytics clarifies the extent to which the words "friendzone" and "fuckzone" are used. All double standards are traditional, the old one and the new one, and they cause gender violence and serious health problems. Over the last decades and even centuries, many feminists, democrats, and egalitarian persons and movements have struggled to make clear steps for the equality of all women and all persons. In the opposite direction, today many women have been pressured to smoke, like only (many) men did before.

Today many girls are pressured to classify boys in the "friendzone" and in the "fuckzone", which only the worse men did with women before. Publicity made them think that they would be more liberated and would get more equality if they smoked. Publicity made them believe that if they had disdainful hookups with "fuckzone" boys they would be more liberated and would get more equality. The dominant discourse even made them think that they were liberated if they did not care whether the boy, they would hook up with was cheating on his girlfriend, or if he had ever beaten her or if he had ever raped any girl.

Scientific research has demonstrated that most sexist and violent boys are classified in the "fuckzone" while most of the egalitarian ones are classified in the "friendzone". A teenager declared in a magazine for adolescent girls: "My parents tell me I should marry a good boy, and I do what they say. Before I marry, I have fun with the bad boys". Publicity has been very efficient in socialising this kind of girls into the belief that the only way to have fun is to hook up with the bad boys, as well as socialising them into the idea that disdainful hookups will have no consequences for their future in their health, their attractiveness, and their sexual-affective relationships.

Scientific research has demonstrated that in most cases the consequences are forever. Prior to the very rich research results we have about tobacco, direct and indirect smokers were not aware of its consequences. Even when the clarification was sufficient in order to face the power of the business and legislate against smoking in classrooms, there was a rebellion of some smokers denying the scientific results. This is what is happening now with the double standard of "friendzone" and "fuckzone". But research is very

clear about this, and no one presents evidence or arguments against the results of those scientific studies. It is very sad that during the decades in which the evidence about tobacco's harmful effects on health was not accepted, this meant that millions of women and men died. It is very sad that during the years in which evidence about the consequences of disdainful hookups with people who disdain and have been categorised into the "fuckzone" is not accepted, there will be many people developing anorexia, anxiety, depression, and other health-related problems, as well as sexual dissatisfaction, as the most exciting and satisfactory sex is the one practiced among free and egalitarian people.

Of course, there are many people who are aware of who pulls the strings and how this kind of nightlife works. They do not subdue themselves to the most sexist businessmen, they do what they desire and with whom they desire. They do not need to portray the image that they are fun because they actually are fun; whenever they want to, they have exciting and excellent sex. They are much beyond the "friendzone" and "fuckzone" classification, they are very attractive to the best girls and the best boys.

Besides economy, sentiments also exist

Before the book "The Wealth of Nations" [2], Adam Smith wrote another one with the title "The theory of moral sentiments" [173]. Unlike other authors who are less experts in economy, this great economist knew that economy is not the basis determining all other dimensions of society, and egotism is not the motivation determining all dimensions of the individual. Sentiments such as friendship and love and emotions such as envy and hatred also play an important role in societies and in individuals.

There are excellent works on the specificity of the different types of democracy and their causes. The French Revolution established democracy in 1789 and by 1799 it had been replaced by a military man who crowned himself emperor in 1804. Robespierre guillotined his best friend from school (Desmoulins) and his wife when Desmoulins dared to express a different opinion, and he did the same with other friends. These decisions were made by him personally.

The North American revolutionaries created the first modern democracy, which has lasted uninterruptedly ever since with presidents lasting a maximum of 8 years. Adams and Jefferson not only had different opinions, but they were also the most intense political rivals at that time. None of them used the guillotine to solve their differences, only dialogue, arguments, and citizens' votes. In the end, they became very good friends, and, with their respective letters, they accompanied each other until each other's last day. It can be argued that the type of democracy of the USA facilitated friendship between rivals, but it can also be argued that friendship among rivals facilitated this kind of democracy.

What is clear is that a democratic and anti-monarchic revolution where differences of opinion ended in the guillotine generated a very warmongering and authoritarian new king (Emperor Napoleon) while another democracy where differences of opinion did not generate assassinations remained with elections every four years for centuries. In order to identify revolution with killing humans, some authors and some people promote two historical hoaxes: the idea that democracy and human rights were first proclaimed by the French Revolution and later replicated in an increasing number of countries. The first modern democratic constitution was approved in 1787 in the United States (based on the one approved by Virginia in 1786). The first Declaration of Human Rights was also approved in the USA in June 1876, influenced by the one approved in Virginia 22 days before.

During Robespierre's regime of terror, politicians' fear of being led to the guillotine undoubtedly had a significant influence on their ideologies and ideological changes. Similarly, the feeling that one could be put to death not only by one's greatest political rival but also by one's closest ally or even friend shaped not only personal, but also political relationships. In contrast, there was no such feeling in the United States; leaders did not sentence their political rivals to death, let alone their friends. Existing methods of analysis "of course" do not attribute any causal relationship between these anecdotes and the different types of democracy that were established, and they do not even consider them to be relevant consequences.

Most analyses consider the relationships between people like Adams and Jefferson or Robespierre and Danton to be mere anecdotes that have no historical significance for understanding the different types of democracy they led. The two Americans were very intense political rivals who turned to citizens' vote to resolve their differences, and over time they developed a friendship that went deeper and deeper. The alleged French revolutionaries, like many others, resolved their differences with the guillotine. Unlike in the United States, the French Revolution led to the imprisonment and death of important scientists such as Lavoisier, Olympe de Gouges and Condorcet.

No one has resolved to what extent the different types of political regimes influenced these also very different personal relationships among their leaders, and to what extent the reverse process was the case. Some authors have impoverished social sciences with affirmations and theories that are not the result of the analysis of reality, but rather of previous ideological ascriptions. Vulgar materialism, whether or not using Marxism, has placed all the emphasis on the material base, denying the importance of feelings, emotions, values, and other dimensions of humankind. Some interpretations of Marxism have believed that it is clear that everything depends on whether we are workers or not. They cannot explain why almost all communist leaders are not working-class members.

In civil wars, the different ways of valuing friendship generate life and death. In Spain, between 1936 and 1939, there were those who saved the lives of their friends who were on the opposing side of the war, those who did nothing to save them, and yet those who did the same as Robespierre: assassinated them. An excellent master's thesis by a student, now a professor, analysed a village where the citizens' assembly decided everything by the dialogue among all neighbours, including rightist landlords and anarchist workers. An army of one anarchist organisation came to the village and wanted to kill the priest. The anarchist leading the assembly told them that no one from this village would be killed and that this army had to abandon the village. When Franco won, the new mayor of the city council was one of the rightist members of the assembly and he protected the anarchist neighbours who Francoists wanted to kill.

Six decades later, the master's student and myself interviewed both the anarchists of this village who were refugees in France and this Francoist mayor. In many villages and towns, the opposite happened. No one can prove that these different actions linked to friendships are a consequence of economic relations. The interviews clarified that the determining element was the sentiment of friendship. Those who do not introduce friendship, love, sex, envy... as components of humans do not manage to understand society nor contribute to transforming it.

Ethical envy: the most destructive envy

There is a lot of excellent scientific literature about envy, elaborated from diverse disciplines sometimes in interdisciplinary collaboration among them [81]. Most research has been focused on the envy linked to others having more success in the socioeconomic status (money, power) or in the attractive status (sexual, friendship). This envy is very destructive for both the ones having it and the ones receiving their attacks. It is not mainly oriented towards those perceived as superiors from the beginning, but against those perceived as equals or inferiors who have more success. The envy against those who were inferior in the past and are now more successful is particularly intensive.

Less has been analysed on ethical envy, but much more will be published in the near future because it is the most destructive in science, society, and individuals. Its main differentiated characteristic is that it mostly does not exist isolated but in combination with the socioeconomic and/or attractive envy. Some individuals or groups are recognised to be very good persons and they do not receive envy attacks if they are not at the same time successful in the socioeconomic and/or attractive status. Some people admire them, others laugh at them, but they are not envious of them because they would not like to be like them. The dominant social structures and social discourses consider it incompatible to be a good person with being attractive or successful in power and economic relations. As this book has already mentioned, Giddens wrote "Why can't a good man be sexy; why can't a sexy man be good?".

What is very disturbing for dominant structures and discourses is when the same individual (or group) is a very good person and is also very successful in the socioeconomic or the attractive status. If people like Giddens state that a man cannot be both good and sexy, the consequence is that if a person seems good but is attractive for many persons it means that the person seems, but is not, good; in fact, they are the worst because they present a self-image of being good hiding very bad intentions and practices. The envious have a similar way of thinking regarding the socioeconomic status; if some people are successful in this area, it is because they are not good persons. Therefore, those having success and seeming like good persons are the worst ones because of their self-image of being good and thus hiding very bad intentions and practices. Of course, the anger of the envious is still much crueller against those who are successful in the three areas: good, attractive and for instance professionally successful.

This situation is the most disturbing because it is the one which is also successful in transforming society, overcoming the worst inequalities, oppressions, and harassments. In families where a brother is a very good person but has lower socioeconomic status and fails to attract people, he does not generate much envy from his brothers; the problem is when this good person is at the same time the most successful in the socioeconomic and attractive domain. In a high school, a good boy who has no success attracting his classmates does not generate envy on bad boys who are successful attracting their classmates; the good boy would be classified in the "friendzone", and the bad boys would be classified in the "fuckzone". One of the popular sayings in some high schools is the following: "the good boys are the ones who like their girlfriends, the bad boys are the ones who sexually satisfy the good boys' girlfriends". Instead of changing the dominant sexist relationships, this situation consolidates and promotes them.

Scientific literature on masculinities is clarifying that good boys of this kind can, if they want, be successful not only in being good but also in being attractive and highly valued professionally. In other words, traditional oppressed masculinities (TOM) can transform themselves into new alternative masculinities (NAM). The NAM are for instance the most active upstanders against gender violence and bullying and any kind of violence

[172]; in collaboration with feminist upstanders, they are transforming society, both in the macro and micro social relationships. The good boys of the TOM's style are usually submissive to the aggressors, to the traditional dominant masculinities (TDM).

There are CEOs looking only for their individual benefits against the wellbeing of workers and against their companies; there are other CEOs that, besides their own benefit, also look for the wellbeing of workers and their own companies, contributing to the wellbeing of society [174]. Some good persons arriving to the position of CEOs have not succeeded themselves nor the companies they manage; those do not transform the economy and society, instead they justify being bad in order not to provoke their own failure and the failure of their companies and even the workers.

In academia, there are professors who are very good persons, who are very active collaborating with poor people and social movements and who have a very positive social impact in improving citizens' lives. Many of them have no professional success in publishing and getting research projects, and even their outstanding social impact is still not evaluated in the universities. Those do not generate envy among their colleagues, sometimes they are even ridiculed as not being outstanding scholars or thinkers and receive expressions or labels like being "the poor people's friends". The ones receiving the most intensive and cruel attacks from the envious are the ones who are very good persons, collaborate with all citizens (including the poorest ones) and social movements, and at the same time have an outstanding success in publishing and getting research projects. When the latter ones also are very attractive for many people, they receive the maximum envious anger and cruel attacks by the envious.

The ethical envy is the one received by the good persons and groups when they are successful in the socioeconomic and attractive domains [175]. In those cases, the envious receive powerful support from the dominant structures and discourses. Followers of these dominant structures and discourses are ready to believe and disseminate any kind of lie about the best persons which indicate that they hide the worst intentions and practices. Acting in Goebbels's style, they are convinced that the bigger the lie, the more times people repeat it, others will believe it is true.

In academia this ethical envy hurts the best persons and groups, the scientific production, the social impact, and the prestige of the university, and it also hurts the envious who act as clumsy as Othello. The same happens in families, high schools, and all kinds of institutions and groups. They are one of the most negative and powerful forces against the improvement of societies and the best people and groups doing it.

The ethical envy is overcome with successful actions like transparency and rewards for goodness. Transparent universities make citizens have a clear idea that the envious are hurting science and society and they thus understand why they make such big lies, and they no longer believe them. Now the academia is finally starting the evaluation of the social impact of professors; with this new dynamic, professors who are good persons and had no success in their evaluations now have a great success in this evaluation.

In schools, the pupils who are NAM and therefore actively support the ones receiving bullying also receive isolating violence, the violence oriented to discourage them from providing such support and hence leave victims isolated. This violence is still more intense due to the envy the TDM boys have against them because of their success in the academic and attractive domains. Some of those TDM boys were good in the past, but they got the same conclusion as Giddens: that in order to be perceived as attractive, they should be bad. After this change towards this double standard, they can accept another boy being good if he is not attractive or being attractive and not good, but they cannot accept another boy being at the same time good and attractive. When the legislation of the country and the school condemn it, the isolating violence reinforced by the ethical envy is weaker than the support from the institution and the community, which is the best reward for the NAMs and victims. This reward for goodness totally transforms the relationships within the school improving the wellbeing and the academic success of all.

Beyond vulgar materialism

Many of the major capitalists who dominate Russia today are former communist leaders. Have their individual motivations really changed, or do they have the same motivations adapted to the new situation? Were they people motivated by achieving an egalitarian society who have suddenly become very different people motivated by their own individual wealth? Or were they people already motivated by their enjoyment of material luxuries and power who once obtained them from their positions in the communist party and the socialist state and now obtain those as capitalists?

People who analyse the actions of all political leaders as being motivated mainly by their ideologies, and who analyse the actions of all citizens as being motivated mainly by money, continuously fail to predict what they will do and say in the future; hence, they are not scientists, they are not sociologists. Max Weber says the ability to predict is one of the characteristics of rationality. The same happens in all sciences. For example, the geocentric theory ceased to be considered true when the heliocentric theory of Copernicus proved to foresee the movements of the celestial bodies much better. This is how science progresses. In fact, for centuries, observations that did not coincide with Ptolemy's geocentric theory were complemented by inventing epicycles that did coincide with those movements.

The same thing is continually done by the vulgar materialist conception of Marxism. If workers do not vote for workers' parties but for bourgeois ones, it is solved by saying that they are alienated and vote against their interests. If the workers' parties are led by intellectuals who have never set foot in a factory, it is said that their class situation is petty bourgeois, but their class position is proletarian. If the luxuries and material conditions of life were as unequal between Stalin and a Russian worker as between Roosevelt and an American worker, it is said that these are necessary contradictions in the socialist phase of evolution towards communism. That is to say, whatever happens, the theory is always right, which shows that vulgar Marxism is neither theory nor truth, but ideological dogmatism.

No one has succeeded in demonstrating that only one of the many and diverse causes that motivate human behaviour and shape societies is the determinant on which the others depend, and no one will succeed because there are many and diverse causes that influence or determine societies: economics, power, status, culture, friendship, love, envy... Since everything in society has been built on the basis of human interactions, relationships and actions, any general theory of society must also be built on the basis of those actions. The great sociologists in history, such as Weber and Parsons, tried to pursue this, but they did so individually and with very little interdisciplinarity and social impact. Much earlier, as mentioned before, Adam Smith had the intelligence to do a great work on emotions before his great work on economics.

With the partial knowledge we have today, analysing each of the various causes that influence or determine societies (economy, power, status, culture, friendship, love, envy...) is much more sensible and, above all, more scientific than establishing one unique cause as the determinant. Since society is a human reality, such a theory can only come from analysing how human action has constituted and is continuously transforming society. We cannot exclude the hypothesis that Robespierre's decision to kill friends and scientists, so detrimental to democracy, was not motivated by defending it but by his lust for power and his contempt for a sentiment of friendship that other people value more.

The readers of this book can right now do a little and quick exercise. Try to search in your memories the many and diverse actions you have done during your life that did not have the objective of obtaining money. Most of you will quickly find actions you have made motivated by sentiments like friendship and love or by emotions like envy or hatred. The theory of rational election affirms that, among all alternatives we have, we choose the one we think will benefit our own interest the most. Even authors of this theory like Elster have considered it very revisionist and have widened it, clarifying that, besides this kind of rational election, human beings also have other motivations like social norms and emotions.

Do humans move the world?

As mentioned before, one of the most useful classifications of social theories considers three types. The first one is focused on structures and systems, the second one on persons and human social groups, and the third one takes into account both, structures and human beings. The analysis focused on systems and structures ends up considering people as mere pieces of machinery that move driven by economic, political, or ideological reasons, not for their own passions, interests, sentiments, emotions, and feelings. When someone affirms that citizens are dominated by the capitalist system and they consume, think, and vote for what capitalism wants, consciously or unconsciously, they are using a systemic or structuralist analysis of society. There are many arguments to clarify the errors within these statements. First, if someone says that human beings think what capitalism wants them to think, they themselves are not human beings, because they do not think what they say human beings think. Second, there is another possible option: because they say that humans think what capitalism wants them to think and they are human beings, what they think is what capitalism wants them to think; that means that capitalism wants them to make the statement they do.

The second type of social theories strengthen human beings instead of the structures and systems of the political, educational, or judicial systems. Its main argument, raised by important authors like Peter Berger, is that structures and systems were created by human beings and will disappear if the human beings disappear. Some of those theories are a kind of social constructivism, the idea that reality is socially constructed. In fact, the most famous book in this matter by Berger and Luckmann has as a title "The social construction of reality" [128]. Theirs is a scientific constructivism; what they mean is that social reality (like marriage or the football league or a political party) is socially constructed. This is very different from the relativist constructivism that identifies natural reality with the human concept of language to name it. Some of those even said that the moon is socially constructed because the reality of the moon as independent of the human being does not exist; the moon is for them only what we have constructed about it, like the name we use.

Another theory strengthening the role of human beings is interactionism, with a very interesting dialogic conception of the person that is useful as the basis for the conception of society. In the theory of George Herbert Mead, the "self" is an interaction between the "I" and the "me". He could not make a clear scientific theorisation on what the "I" is, and he related it with the reactions of the organism to what comes from the external world. We have much more knowledge now, for instance from socioneuroscience, to understand this sort of concept. The concept of "me" is much more elaborated by Mead, it includes the interiorisation in one's "self" of the other people with whom the "I" interacts.

Current social theories take into account both structures and human beings. On the one hand, it is clear that social constructivism says that structures and systems have been constructed and are now maintained by human beings. On the other hand, it is also true that structures and systems not only form part of society, but also influence humans, they can even be found inside ourselves. As an example, it is clear that each citizen votes for the political party they decide, but it is also clear that their vote is influenced by systems such as the media. In order to analyse society and clarify the consequences of each of the open options, it is necessary to take into account both structures and human beings.

There have been several efforts by individual authors to create a general theory of that kind. Giddens elaborated the structuration theory [176] in which what he called structures and human agency have a role in society. Habermas elaborated the most quoted one, the "The Theory of Communicative Action", analysing the role of the system and the lifeworld. The German author did an excellent work taking from theories of structures and systems the elements of analysis that are useful for a theory that considers these are important dimensions of the social reality. Moreover, he also analysed profoundly the contributions by Mead and interactionism, another of the dimensions of social reality. Apart from some errors already mentioned in this book, he could not resolve the respective interactions and relations between structures and human agencies or between systems and lifeworlds.

Dialogue includes both dimensions of the social reality and of the individual reality that authors like Habermas tried to analyse. Sometimes the word "dialogue" is reduced to an exchange of words. The diverse dualisms have remained until now. On the one hand, "The Theory of Communicative Action" includes the kind of dualism between systems and lifeworlds but does not give priority to one of them nor neglect the other, and this is very positive. What is needed now are social theories that analyse both dimensions) systems and humans, but not as two separate sources of the social reality, but as interactive sources, interacting with one another, and this is what dialogic theories do.

REFERENCES

1. Kandel ER, Schwartz JH, Jessell TM. Principles of Neural Science. New York: Appleton & Lange; 2013.

2. Smith A. The Wealth of Nations. J. J. Tourneisen and J. L. Legrand; 1776.

3. Beck-Gernsheim E, Butler J, Puigvert L. Women and Social Transformation. Bern: Peter Lang; 2003.

4. Einstein A, Infeld L. The Evolution of Physics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1942.

5. Freud F. Civilization and Its Discontents. London: Penguin; 2002 (o.p. 1930).

6. Weber M. Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology. New York: Bedminster Press; 1968 (o.p. 1921).

7. Hawking S. A Brief History of Time: From the Big Bang to Black Holes. New York City: Bantam Dell Publishing Group; 1988.

8. Darwin C. On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life. London: John Murray; 1859.

9. Nietzsche F. On the Genealogy of Morality: A Polemic. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2006 (o.p. 1887).

10. Weil S. Historical, Political, and Moral Writings. Eugene: WIPF & STOCK Publishers; 2015 (o.p. 1934-1943).

11. de Beauvoir S. The Second Sex. London: Jonathan Cape; 1953 (o.p. 1949).

12. Heidegger M. Being and Time. London: SCM Press; 1962 (o.p. 1927).

13. Sen A. The Argumentative Indian. London: Allen Lane; 2005.

14. Chomsky N. Language and Mind. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2006.

15. Freire P. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Herder and Herder; 1970.

16. Harris M. Cultural anthropology. New York City: Harper & Row; 1983.

17. Eco U. The Limits of Interpretation. Bloomington: Indiana University Press; 1990.

18. Hauser, A. The Social History of Art. Abingdon-on-Thames: Routledge; 1955 (o.p. 1951).

19. Kant I. Critique of Pure Reason. London: Palgrave Macmillan; 1929 (o.p. 1781).

20. "When Ulrich Beck came to Spain for the first time in November 1998, he shared a seminar about his theories with several members of CREA. The condition for attending was to have read the six books by this author that had been published in Spanish, with independence from any academic hierarchy. This made the feudal lords very angry, as they were used to being the ones who related to the coming authors, even if they had not read any of their books, while those in lower academic positions did not relate, even if they had read them. In this centre, things were not done in this way, by academic categories, those who had done the reading, even if they were students, attended the seminary, and those who had not done it, even if they were professors, did not. A nineteen year old student, who looked less than that and had entered the centre in March, worked on all the six books during the summer and participated in the seminar. At one point she interrupted Ulrich by rectifying one of the statements he had made about his own theory. Beck was surprised and remained in his position, to which Carme Garcia responded by showing him how in her book she said something different. Ulrich's answer was: "Where is the miracle? He soon understood that the miracle was in those intellectual dialogues, he had written that book ten years earlier and Carme had just read it. Since then, Beck has always been very supportive of all the young people at CREA." Creative Friendships, p. 189. Available: https://hipatiapress.com/index/en/2020/05/14/amistades-creadoras-2/

21. Berger PL. The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion. Garden City: Doubleday & Company; 1967.

22. Berger PL (Ed.). The Desecularization of the World: Resurgent Religion and World Politics. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; 1999.

23. myth. In: Cambridge Dictionary [Internet]. [cited 11 Sep 2022]. Available: https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/myth

24. Husserl E. The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology. Evanston: Northwestern University Press; 1970 (o.p. 1936). Husserl included in the definition of the lifeworld the following words: "The lifeworld, for us who are wakingly live in it, is always already there, existing in advance for us".

25. Schütz A. The Phenomenology of the Social World. Illinois: Northwestern University Press; 1967 (o.p. 1932).

26. Roca-Campos E, Duque E, Ríos O, Ramis-Salas M. The Zero Violence Brave Club: A Successful Intervention to Prevent and Address Bullying in Schools. Front Psychiatry. 2021;12: 601424. doi:10.3389/fpsyt.2021.601424

27. Madrid A, Joanpere M, de Botton L, Campdepadrós R. Media Manipulation Against Social Justice Researchers: Second-Order Sexual Harassment. Qual Inq. 2020;26: 983–988. doi:10.1177/1077800420938853

28. Van den Besselaar P, Flecha R, Radauer A. Monitoring the Impact of the EU Framework Programmes. European Commission; 2018.

29. Herre, Roser. Democracy. Our World in Data. Available: https://ourworldindata.org/democracy

30. Machiavelli N. Letter to the Florentine historian Francesco Guicciardini. 1521.

31. Chomsky N. The Responsibility of Intellectuals. The New York Review of Books. 1967. Available: https://www.nybooks.com/articles/1967/02/23/a-special-supplement-the-responsibility-of-intelle/

32. Machiavelli N. The Prince. 1532.

33. Wright EO. Envisioning Real Utopias. New York City, NY: Verso

Books; 2010.

34. Weber M. The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. New York: Penguin; 1930 (o.p. 1905).

35. AfricTivistes [Internet]. [cited 31 Oct 2022]. Available: https://www.africtivistes.com/en/

36. Ciencia en el parlamento. [cited 31 Oct 2022]. Available: https://cienciaenelparlamento.org/

37. Flecha, R (PI). Workalo. The creation of new occupational patterns for cultural minorities: the gypsy case. European Union Fifth Framework Programme (FP5/1998-2002). Grant agreement num. HPSE-CT-2001-00101. 2001-2004. Available: https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/HPSE-CT-2001-00101

38. Flecha, R (PI). Includ-ed. Strategies for inclusion and social cohesion in Europe from education. European Union Sixth Framework Programme (FP6/2002-2006). Grant agreement num. 28603. 2006-2011. Available: https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/28603

39. Flecha R, Soler M. Turning difficulties into possibilities: Engaging Roma families and students in school through dialogic learning. Cambridge Journal of Education. 2013;43: 451–465. doi:10.1080/0305764X.2013.819068

40. Flecha, R (PI). IMPACT-EV. Evaluating the impact and outcomes of European SSH research. European Union Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2014-2017). Grant Agreement num. 613202. 2014-2017. Available: https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/613202/reporting

41. Flecha, R (PI). Allinteract. Widening and diversifying citizen engagement in science. H2020. Grant Agreement num. 872396. 2020-2023. Available: https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/872396

42. FECYT. Fundación Española Para la Ciencia y la Tecnología. Towards Inclusive Science Communication: Reflections and Successful Actions. 2021. Available: https://www.fecyt.es/es/publicacion/hacia-una-comunicacion-inclusiva-de-la-ciencia-reflexiones-y-acciones-de-exito

43. Burawoy M. Public Sociology: Between Utopia and Anti-Utopia. Cambridge: Polity Press; 2021.

44. Althusser L, Balibar E, Rancière J, Establet R, Macherey P. Reading Capital. London: New Left Books; 1970 (o.p. 1968).

45. Althusser L. The Future Lasts Forever: A Memoir. New Press: New Press; 1993.

46. Marx K. Capital: A Critique of Political Economy. London: Swan Sonnenschein, Lowrey & Co.; 1887 (o.p. 1867).

47. Marx K. Inaugural Address of the International Working Men's Association. London: Zodiac/Brian Baggins; 1864.

48. Cheney G, Santa Cruz I, Peredo AM, Nazareno E. Worker cooperatives as an organizational alternative: Challenges, achievements and promise in business governance and ownership. Organization. 2014;21: 591–603. doi:10.1177/1350508414539784

49. Joyce J. Ulysses. Paris: Shakespeare and Company; 1922.

50. Proust M. In Search of Lost Time. New York: Modern Library; 2003 (o.p. 1913).

51. Bakhtin, M. The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays. Austin: University of Texas Press; 1982 (o.p. 1975).

52. Bakhtin M. Speech Genres and Other Late Essays. Austin: University of Texas Press; 1986. "At any moment in the development of the dialogue there are immense, boundless masses of forgotten contextual meanings, but at certain moments of the dialogue's subsequent development along the way they are recalled and invigorated in renewed form (in a new context). Nothing is absolutely dead".

53. Mills CW. The Sociological Imagination. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1959.

54. Mead GH. Mind, Self, and Society. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press; 1934.

55. Kandel ER. In Search of Memory: The Emergence of a New Science of

Mind. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company; 2007.

56. Dukas P, Librettist: Maeterlinck M. Ariane et Barbe-bleue. Paris; 1906.

57. Puigvert L, Flecha R. Definitions of coercive discourse, coerced preferences and coerced hooking-up. 2018. Available: https://archive.org/details/NewConcepts/mode/1up

58. Amaral. Sin ti no soy nada. Virgin Records; 2002.

59. Racionero-Plaza S, Ugalde L, López de Aguileta G, Flecha R. "It is so hard that some people commit suicide": Harassment in peer groups to engage in disdainful hookups. Under Review Child Abuse & Neglect.

60. Puivert L, Flecha R. Dialogue of memories. 2021. Available: https://archive.org/details/Dialogueofmemories/mode/1up

61. Puigvert L, Racionero S, Flecha R. Dialogic Reconstruction of Memory. 2020. Available: https://archive.org/details/dialogic-reconstructionofmemory/mode/1up

62. More T. Utopia. 1516.

63. Machado A. Campos de Castilla. Madrid: Renacimiento; 1912.

64. Austin JL. How to do things with words. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1962.

65. Sappho. Poems.

66. Einstein A. Obituary for Emmy Noether. New York Times. 1 May 1935.

67. Webster JHD. Golden-mean Form In Music. Music & Letters. 1950;31: 238–248. doi:10.1093/ml/XXXI.3.238

68. Baldwin E. "Design can be a Powerful Tool for Good": Mariam Kamara on Changing Narratives through Architecture. In: ArchDaily [Internet]. 30 Apr 2019 [cited 4 Oct 2022]. Available: https://www.archdaily.com/916140/design-can-be-a-powerful-tool-for-good-mariam-kamara-on-changing-narratives-through-architecture

69. Sappho. Translated by Anne Carson. If Not, Winter: Fragments of Sappho. New York: Vintage Books; 2002.

70. Condorcet N. Sur l'admission des femmes au droit de cité. 1790.

71. Wollstonecraft M. A Vindication of the Rights of Men. London: J. Johnson; 1790.

72. Roca Campos E. Diálogo Igualitario, Feminismos y Nuevas Masculinidades Alternativas. DF Diario Feminista. 10 Mar 2019. Available: https://eldiariofeminista.info/2019/03/11/dialogo-igualitario-feminismos-y-nuevas-masculinidades-alternativas/.

73. Anonymous. Arabian Nights. Oxford: Ginn and Company; 1915 (o.p. n.d.).

74. DF Diario Feminista. Available: https://eldiariofeminista.info/

75. Morlà-Folch T, Renta Davis AI, Padrós Cuxart M, Valls R. A research synthesis of the impacts of successful educational actions on student outcomes. Educational Research Review. 2022. doi:10.1016/j.edurev.2022.100482

76. Díez-Palomar J, García-Carrión R, Hargreaves L, Vieites M. Transforming students' attitudes towards learning through the use of successful educational actions. PLoS One. 2020;15: e0240292. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0240292

77. Ania Ballesteros [Comunitat d'aprenentage Montserrat de Terrassa]. Youtube; 9 Aug 2012 [cited 16 Sep 2022]. Available: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F-2zOJ6-ni8

78. Sanchez Aroca M. Voices Inside Schools - La Verneda-Sant Martí: A school where people Dare to dream. Harv Educ Rev. 1999;69: 320–336. doi:10.17763/haer.69.3.gx588q10614q3831

79. Klinenberg E. Palaces for the People: How Social Infrastructure Can Help Fight Inequality, Polarization, and the Decline of Civic Life. New York: Crown Publishing Group; 2018.

80. Copernicus. De Revolutionibus Orbium Coelestium. 1543.

81. Elster J. Alchemies of the Mind. Rationality and the Emotions. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press; 1998.

82. Melgar P, Geis-Carreras G, Flecha R, Soler M. Fear to Retaliation: The Most Frequent Reason for Not Helping Victims of Gender Violence. International and Multidisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences. 2021;10: 31-50. doi:10.17583/rimcis.2021.8305

83. Vidu A, Puigvert L, Flecha R, Lopez de Aguileta G. The concept and the name of Isolating Gender Violence. GENEROS. 2021;10: 176–200. doi:10.17583/generos.2021.8622

84. García Lorca F, López VH (trad.). Mariana Pineda. Marroney PR, Anderson R, editors. A translation and transposition into an acting edition of Federico García Lorca's Mariana Pineda, University of Arizona. 1961.

85. Kuhn T. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1996 (o.p. 1962).

86. Bruno G. The Ash Wednesday Supper. 1584.

87. Pulido CM, Villarejo-Carballido B, Redondo-Sama G, Gómez A. COVID-19 infodemic: More retweets for science-based information on coronavirus than for false information. Int Sociol. 2020;35: 377–392. doi:10.1177/0268580920914755

88. Horton M, Freire P. We Make the Road by Walking. Conversations on Education and Social Change. Bell B, Gaventa J, Peters J, editors. Philadelphia: Temple University Press; 1990.

89. Valientes.

    No solo hablan, actúan
No dejan a nadie aislada
No miran para otro lado
Siempre serán tus hadas

Safo inspira tu relato
Que nadie te calle, ¡habla!
Ya serás siempre muy libre
Ya no serás acosada

Nunca más serás víctima
Estarás acompañada
Scheherezade está contigo
Puedes irte con Ariadna.

90. Cooper D, Faye JP, Faye MO, Foucault M, Zecca M. Dialogue sur l'enfermement et la répression psychiatrique. Change. 1977;32-33: 76–110.

91. Foucault M. Les Mots et les Choses: Une Archéologie des Sciences Humaines. Paris: Éditions Gallimard; 1966.

92. Foucault M. Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. New York City: Pantheon Books; 1977 (o.p.1975).

93. Foucault M. The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences. London: Routledge; 2002 (o.p. 1966).

94. "Dans la seconde partie du roman (…) Le texte de Cervantes se replie sur lui-même, s'enfonce dans sa propre épaisseur, et devient pour soi objet de son propre récit" (p. 62)

95. Spitz C. De las Meninas a las Otras Meninas Del Viejo Continente al Nuevo Mundo. In: Letra Urbana [Internet]. 21 Jun 2014 [cited 21 Sep 2022]. Available: https://letraurbana.com/articulos/de-las-meninas-a-las-otras-meninas-del-viejo-continente-a-america/

96. Süskind P. Perfume: The story of a murderer. London: Penguin Books; 1985.

97. Giddens A, Habermas J, Jay M, McCarthy T, Rorty R, Wellmer A, et al. Habermas y la modernidad. Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra; 1988.

98. Giddens A. The Transformation of Intimacy. Sexuality, Love, and Eroticism in Modern Societies. Redwood City: Stanford University Press; 1992.

99. Beck U, Beck-Gernsheim E. The Normal Chaos of Love. Cambridge: Polity; 1995.

100. Neruda P. Confieso Que He Vivido. Montoto M, editor. Barcelona: Createspace; 1974.

101. O'Hagan S. Man of steel. The Guardian. 4 Oct 2008. Available: https://amp.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2008/oct/05/serra.art. Accessed 23 Sep 2022.

102. Bourdieu P. Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste. Cambridge, USA: Harvard University Press; 1987 (o.p. 1979).

103. People — Mariam Issoufou Kamara. In: Atelier Masomi [Internet]. [cited 4 Oct 2022]. Available: http://www.ateliermasomi.com/team

104. Pulido CM, Redondo-Sama G, Sordé-Martí T, Flecha R. Social impact in social media: A new method to evaluate the social impact of research. PLoS One. 2018;13: e0203117. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0203117

105. Pulido Rodríguez C, Villarejo Carballido B, Redondo-Sama G, Guo M, Ramis M, Flecha R. False news around COVID-19 circulated less on Sina Weibo than on Twitter. How to overcome false information? RIMCIS. 2020;9: 107–128. doi:10.17583/rimcis.2020.5386

106. Sappho - Scientific evidence platform Gender. [cited 25 Jun 2022]. Available: https://socialimpactscience.org/gender/

107. Adhyayana - Scientific Evidence Platform Education. [cited 25 Jun 2022]. Available: https://socialimpactscience.org/education/

108. Giddens A. Modernity and Self-Identity. Self and Society in the Late Modern Age. Cambridge: Polity Press; 1991.

109. Bourdieu P. Choses dites. Paris: Editions de Minuit; 1987.

110. Addams J. Twenty Years at Hull-House. New York: The Macmillan Company; 1910.

111. Downey K. The Woman Behind the New Deal: The Life of Frances Perkins, FDR's Secretary of Labor and His Moral Conscience. New York: Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group; 2009.

112. Castells M, Flecha R, Freire P, Giroux HA, Macedo D, Willis P. Critical Education in the New Information Age. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield; 1999.

113. Burawoy M. Meeting the Challenge of Global Sociology – from Gothenburg to Yokohama. ISA Global Dialogue Newsletter. 2010;1: 8. Available: https://globaldialogue.isa-sociology.org/articles/meeting-the-challenge-of-global-sociology-from-gothenburg-to-yokohama

114. Burawoy, M (Ed.). Special Issue: Precarious Engagements: Combat in the Realm of Public Sociology. Curr Sociol. 2014;62. Available: https://journals.sagepub.com/toc/csi/62/2

115. Stromberg R. Max Weber and World War I: Culture and Politics. Dalhousie Review. 1979;59: 350–357. Available: http://hdl.handle.net/10222/60135

116. Diverse authors have published Durkheim's alleged defence of French colonialism "but resorting only exceptionally to violence". They quote "Pacifisme et patriotisme" but I cannot see this statement in the diverse versions of this publication I have consulted. http://portal.amelica.org/ameli/journal/54/5413004/html/

117. Reniu JM, Soler M, Solé E. Notes per a una història de la Ciència Política i de la Sociologia catalanes. Barcelona: Huygens Editorial; 2021.

118. International Sociological Association. Ranking order. [cited 14 Mar 2021]. Available: https://www.isa-sociology.org/en/about-isa/history-of-isa/books-of-the-xx-century/ranking-order

119. Comte A. Course of Positive Philosophy. 1830-1842.

120. Spencer H. The Principles of Psychology. Covent Garden: Williams and Norgate; 1870.

121. Durkheim E. The Rules of Sociological Method. New York: The Free Press; 1982 (o.p. 1895).

122. Durkheim E. The Division of Labour in Society. New York: Free Press; 1969 (o.p. 1893).

123. Durkheim E. The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life. New York: The Free Press; 1995 (o.p. 1912).

124. Sales i Ferré M. Tratado de sociología: Evolución social y política.

Madrid: Victoriano Suárez; 1889-1897.

125. Parsons T. The Negro American. Boston: Houghton Mifflin; 1966.

126. Parsons T. The Social System. Oxfordshire, UK: Routledge; 1991.

127. Luhmann N. Theory of Society. Stanford: Stanford University Press; 2012 (o.p. 1997).

128. Berger PL, Luckmann T. The Social Construction of Reality. New York, NY: Anchor Books; 1966.

129. Goffman E. The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. New York City: Doubleday; 1956.

130. Elias N. The Civilizing Process. Oxford: Blackwell; 1969 (o.p. 1939).

131. Beck U. Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity. Madrid: Siglo XXI; 2006.

132. Habermas J. The theory of Communicative Action. Volume I. Reason and the Rationalization of Society. Boston, MA: Beacon Press; 1984 (o.p. 1981).

133. Mernissi F. Scheherazade Goes West: Different Cultures, Different Harems. New York: Washington Square Press; 2002 (o.p. 2000).

134. Soler-Gallart M. Achieving Social Impact. Sociology in the Public Sphere. Springer; 2017.

135. Burawoy M. Sociology as a vocation: Moral commitment and scientific imagination. Curr Sociol. 2014;62: 279–284. doi:10.1177/0011392113515796

136. Bourdieu P, Passeron JC. Reproduction in education, society and culture. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications; 1990 (o.p. 1970).

137. Apple M. Can education change society? New York: Routledge; 2012.

138. Flecha R. Conocimiento e Identidad. Barcelona: El Roure; 2004.

139. Derrida J. Of Grammatology. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University

Press; 1997 (o.p. 1967).

140. Giner E, Ruiz L, Serrano MÁ, Valls R. Free Women's Contributions to Working-Class Women's Sexual Education during the Spanish Civil War (1936–1939) and Beyond. Teach Coll Rec. 2016;118: 1–38. doi:10.1177/016146811611800401

141. Farias V. Heidegger y el nazismo. Barcelona: Muchnik Editores; 1989 (o.p. 1987).

142. Heidegger M. Declaration of Support for Adolf Hitler and the National Socialist State (November 11, 1933). Heidegger demanded the vote for Hitler presenting him as the realisation of the Dasein: "German teachers and comrades! German Volksgenossen and Volksgenossinnen! The German people have been summoned by the Führer to vote, the Führer, however, is asking nothing from the people. Rather, he is giving the people the possibility of making, directly, the highest free decision of all: whether the entire people wants its own existence (Dasein) or whether it does not want it." When those followers are told about this, they say two more mistakes: Heidegger rectified his support to Nazi ideology and his work is totally different from what he did. The first mistake is easy to discover because he died without this rectification and he did not do it even in his posthumous letter. The second one is difficult to be discovered by those "anti Nazi" intellectuals followers of Heidegger because they need to read his main books or at least the most important one: "Being and time". Heidegger justified and promoted violence: "All faculties of will and thought, all strengths of the heart and all skills of the body, must be unfolded through battle, heightened in battle, and preserved as battle".

143. Diario de Sesiones. 48 1931. Available: https://www.congreso.es/backoffice_doc/prensa/notas_prensa/54648_1506689774662.pdf

144. Coleman JS, Campbell EQ, Hobson CJ, McPartland J, Mood AM, Weinfield FD, et al. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office; 1966.

145. Habermas J, Rawls J. Debate sobre el liberalismo político. Barcelona: Ediciones Paidós; 1998.

146. Parsons T. The Evolution of Societies. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall; 1977.

147. The concept of communicative acts is already facilitating an increasing number of judges to take into account whether the word "yes" was said in a context of freedom or in a context of power and violence. It is also facilitating the norms of sports and academic institutions to prevent sexual relationships mediated by power. In 2019, the University of California, Berkeley, revoked the Emeritus status of Austin's former student John Searle due to the accusations of having exchanged academic favours by sexual relationships. Most of those who had professional relationships with him cut them after knowing this.

148. Searle J, Soler M. Lenguaje y ciencias sociales: Diálogo entre John Searle y CREA. Barcelona: El Roure; 2004.

149. There is unlimited evidence of these misreading errors. Just to add one more, it is the continuous translation of Giddens' book "Modernity and Self Identity" as "Modernidad e Identidad del yo" and, in general, "self" by "yo", whereby both the two very different concepts of "I" and "Self" are translated by the same Spanish word "yo" thus making it impossible to distinguish when it is referring to one and when to the other. However, most readers do not realise this mistake and there are professors who explain it to their students. I am a direct witness that in some cases if a bright student notices it and corrects the professor, the professor corrects him and not the translation

150. Larivière V, Gingras Y, Archambault É. Canadian collaboration networks: A comparative analysis of the natural sciences, social sciences and the humanities. Scientometrics. 2006;68: 519–533. doi:10.1007/s11192-006-0127-8

151. Puigvert L. The Dialogic Turn: Dialogue or Violence? RIMCIS. 2012;1: 78–96. doi:10.4471/rimcis.2012.04

152. Parsons T. Action theory and the human condition. New York: Free Press; 1978.

153. Giner i Gota E. Creative Friendships. Barcelona: Hipatia Press; 2018.

154. Habermas J. The Theory of Communicative Action. Volume Two.

Lifeworld and System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason. Boston: Beacon Press; 1987 (o.p. 1981).

155. Parsons T. Social systems and the evolution of action theory. New York: Free Press; 1977.

156. Ramon y Cajal S. Rules and advice on scientific investigation. Madrid: Grupo Editor Rca; 2009 (o.p. 1910).

157. Waldinger R. The Harvard Longitudinal Study on Adult Development. [cited 12 Dec 2021]. Available: https://www.adultdevelopmentstudy.org/publications

158. Ramon y Cajal S. Recollections of My Life. London: MIT Press; 1989.

159. Haggbloom SJ, Warnick R, Warnick JE, Jones VK, Yarbrough GL, Russell TM, et al. The 100 Most Eminent Psychologists of the 20th Century. Rev Gen Psychol. 2002;6: 139–152. doi:10.1037/1089-2680.6.2.139

160. Skinner BF. Reflections on Behaviorism and Society. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall; 1978.

161. Telzer EH, Fuligni AJ, Lieberman MD, Miernicki ME, Galván A. The quality of adolescents' peer relationships modulates neural sensitivity to risk taking. Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci. 2015;10: 389–398. doi:10.1093/scan/nsu064

162. Puigvert Mallart L, Flecha García R, Racionero-Plaza S, Sordé-Martí T. Socioneuroscience and its contributions to conscious versus unconscious volition and control. The case of gender violence prevention. AIMS Neuroscience. 2019;6: 204–218. doi:10.3934/Neuroscience.2019.3.204

163. Racionero-Plaza S, Puigvert L, Soler-Gallart M, Flecha R. Contributions of Socioneuroscience to Research on Coerced and Free Sexual-Affective Desire. Front Behav Neurosci. 2022;15: 814796. doi:10.3389/fnbeh.2021.814796

164. Puigvert L, Gelsthorpe L, Soler-Gallart M, Flecha R. Girls'

perceptions of boys with violent attitudes and behaviours, and of sexual attraction. Palgrave Communications. 2019;5: 56. doi:10.1057/s41599-019-0262-5

165. Klein SB, Robertson TE, Delton AW. Facing the future: memory as an evolved system for planning future acts. Mem Cognit. 2010;38: 13–22. doi:10.3758/MC.38.1.13

166. Gómez J. Radical Love: A Revolution for the 21st Century. New York, NY: Peter Lang; 2015.

167. Ugalde L, Racionero-Plaza S, Munté A, Tellado I. Dialogic reconstruction of memories of violent sexual-affective relationships via dialogic gatherings of "Radical Love." Child Youth Serv Rev. 2022;139: 106548. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2022.106548

168. López de Aguileta G, Torras-Gómez E, Padrós M, Oliver E. Dialogic Reconstruction of Memory: A Methodological Contribution Aimed at Social Impact on Youth's Sexual-Affective Relationships. International Journal of Qualitative Methods. 2021;20: 16094069211034596. doi:10.1177/16094069211034596

169. Encyclopædia Britannica. Freud's trieb.

170. Erikson E, Erikson J. The life cycle completed. London: W. W. Norton; 1998.

171. Levi-Montalcini R. L'asso nella manica a brandelli. Milan: Baldini Castoldi Dalai Editore; 1998.

172. Flecha R, Puigvert L, Rios O. The New Alternative Masculinities and the Overcoming of Gender Violence. International and Multidisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences. 2013;2: 88–113. doi:10.4471/rimcis.2013.14

173. Smith A. The Theory of Moral Sentiments. Edinburgh: A. Millar, A. Kincaid and J. Bell; 1759.

174. Flecha R, Ngai P. The challenge for Mondragon: Searching for the cooperative values in times of internationalization. Organization. 2014;21: 666–682. doi:10.1177/1350508414537625

175. Flecha R, Puigvert L, Gomez J. Definition of ethical envy. 2003.

Available: https://archive.org/details/ethical-envy/mode/1up

176. Giddens A. The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration. Cambridge: Polity Press; 1984.

177. A library where people dare to dream © 2022 by Ane López de Aguileta is licensed under Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 4.0 International

178. Guggenheim art museum © 2022 by Garazi Álvarez Guerrero is licensed under Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 4.0 International

179. Foto de formación de rocas marrones y verdes en el mar bajo © 2020 Luismi Sánchez is licensed under Unsplash License. https://unsplash.com/es/fotos/-TSKGoVO-KI

180. Foto de grupo de personas sentadas © 2021 Beth Mcdonald is licensed under Unsplash License. https://unsplash.com/es/fotos/mbND4xtrlVY

181. Cuadro La Nascita Di Venere - Botticelli © 2012 Wikimages is licensed under Pixabay License. https://pixabay.com/es/photos/cuadro-la-nascita-di-venere-63186/

182. Vacuna Coronavirus Médico © 2021 Spencer Davis is licensed under Pixabay License. https://pixabay.com/es/photos/vacuna-coronavirus-m%c3%a9dico-mano-6165772/

183. Colaboración Colaborador Libro © 2015 Dianne Hope is licensed under Pixabay License. https://pixabay.com/es/photos/colaboraci%c3%b3n-colaborador-libro-1106196/

THE DIALOGIC SOCIETY

"It looks to me a brilliant formulation of so much of what you have contributed to the social sciences and humanity. So generous to so many people. So wide-ranging and "cultured" in the good sense of the word, bringing to social science much more than social science - literature, music, art. I'm so delighted you have written this and in such an accessible narrative style". **Michael Burawoy, Former President of the International Sociological Association**

"I like to know that these Literary Gatherings interest people so much and they are so successful (…) your work plan is extraordinary and necessary to bring awareness about people's individuality in a society that we try to make more and more solidary". **José Saramago, Nobel Prize laureate in Literature**

"Citizens like and use this sociology because it creates new social realities that improve our lives". **Ana Lebron, Citizen, Manual Worker**

"As well as wishing for a better world, he is striving to achieve it... Ramon, thank you for giving us hope". **Tontxu Campos, Former Minister in the Basque Government**

"The content of the book has allowed me as a student to not waste my time in nonscientific theories and use from the beginning this sociology citizens and scientists like and use. The 9 principles as 9 muses will completely mark this beginning". **Ane López de Aguileta, PhD Student**

Dialogic sociology is creating reflections of the highest scientific and theoretical level than ever before. **Marta Soler, Former President of the European Sociological Association**